687. g. 25
2
2
K
(7)

EVIDENCE

THAT THE

RELATION OF JOSEPHUS

CONCERNING

HEROD'S HAVING NEW BUILT

THE

TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM

IS EITHER

FALSE OR MISINTERPRETED.

Charles Hawtrey, M.A.

THE SECOND EDITION WITH ADDITIONS.

OXFORD:

PRINTED FOR J. FLETCHER IN THE TURLE.

AND SOLD BY MESS. RIVINGTON IN ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; AND T. PAYNE AND SON, AT THE MEWS GATE, LONDON.

MDCCLXXXVIII.

PREFACE.

IF the evidence in the enſuing pages is really what it pretends to be, the Prophecy of Haggai will be freed from thoſe exceptions which have been taken to it from the miſrepreſented account of Herod's operations on the Temple, given us by the Jewiſh Hiſtorian, and we ſhall be at liberty to affirm, and without danger of contradiction, that the Meſſiah did come into the world while the ſecond Temple was ſtanding: and moreover, for any thing Joſephus ſays to contradict it, we may affirm alſo that the Prophecy is a direct and diſtinct Prophecy of the Meſſiah, predicting that he ſhould come into the world while the ſecond Temple was ſtanding, and that he ſhould glorify it by his preſence.

In oppoſition to this it is preſumed nothing can be alledged, except what is urged by

thoſe who contend that however the Meſſiah might have come while the ſecond Temple was ſtanding, yet the Prophecy hath no reference either to him or to his advent, it having relation only to the ornaments and decorations which the Temple was in future to receive, and which was accompliſhed in the days of Herod the Great. That the word חמדת relates only to the ſilver and gold, and other things of value with which the Temple was to be decorated; that it ought not to be tranſlated *deſire*, but *deſirable* or *precious* things; that thus it was interpreted by all antiquity, and that none of the more antient writers of the Church ever thought of applying the Prophecy to Chriſt.

To obviate this, it is imagined, there will be no occaſion for any great degree of trouble. The antient Fathers, particularly in the more early ages of Chriſtianity, underſtood little or nothing of Hebrew. Their text was the Septuagint, which they held in as high eſtimation as if it had been the original

ginal revelation itſelf. And the ſeptuagint having tranſlated the word εκλεκτα, and moreover having made that unjuſtifiable addition which is ſo deſtructive of the true meaning of the prophecy και ειρηνην ψυχης εις περιποιησιν, &c. it in a manner precluded them from any application of it to the Meſſiah; and therefore it is that the antient Fathers have not made that uſe of the Prophecy which otherwiſe they moſt aſſuredly would have done.

Hence alſo, as the Septuagint was the text, almoſt all the antient verſions were made from thence, and ſo of courſe we ſee in them almoſt the ſame miſinterpretation of the word חמדת as in the Septuagint; and therefore any objection to our tranſlation of the word, from the ſilence of the antient Writers, or from the miſinterpretation of it in the antient verſions, is of no force: and perhaps of equal force will be any objection that is derived from the words themſelves of the Prophecy; for when critically examined it will appear, that if חמדת כל הגוים be not tranſlated

tranſlated the *deſire of all nations* it will not be tranſlated right. However, before we proceed to the examination it will be proper to make an obſervation or two on the Septuagint tranſlation of the word under conſideration, which, inſtead of clearing up matters, only ſerves to embaraſs them, as it leaves us entirely at a loſs to determine any thing concerning its genuine ſignification; nay, and does not even enable us to determine, whether, in their own conception, the word was a ſubſtantive or an adjective, or in the ſingular or in the plural number.

If no paſſage has been overlooked, the ſimple word חמדת, in this form, occurs only four times in the ſacred writings, 1 Samuel ix. 20. 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 10. Daniel xi. 57. Haggai xi. 8. The paſſages from each of which, with the Septuagint Verſion of them, are as follow

1 Sam. ix. 20. ולמי כל חמדת και τινι τα ωραια.

2 Chron. xxxvi. 10. עם כלי חמרת μετα των σκευων των επιθυμητων

Dan.

Dan. xi. 37. ועל חמדת נשים και επιθυμιαν γυναικων.

Haggai xi. 8. ובאו חמדת כל הגוים και ηξει τα εκλεκτα παντων των εθνων.

Here then, in the firſt inſtance, we have the word tranſlated τα ωραια: in the ſecond των επιθυμητων: in the third, not plural as in the others, but in the ſingular number επιθυμιαν: and in the laſt τα εκλεκτα. Now from this diverſity of interpretation, who will venture to pronounce any thing deciſively concerning either the number or ſignification of the word in their conception? If they have tranſlated it as an adjective in one place, they have tranſlated it as a ſubſtantive in another; and if they have tranſlated it plural in one place, they have tranſlated the very ſame word as a ſingular in another; ſo that no kind of inference, of any the leaſt validity, can be drawn from the interpretation which the Seventy have put upon the word חמדת that can at all affect the Vulgate or our Engliſh tranſlation of it. If any one ſhould aſk, Why they tranſlated the word plural if they knew it

was

was ſingular? the only anſwer that ſeems capable of being given is, they thought it a more elegant tranſlation than if they had rendered it επιθυμια, which, although it be the true literal rendering of the word, they might think conveyed an improper idea. Let their reaſon however have been what it will, the manner in which they have tranſlated it doth not in the leaſt tend to ſettle whether it was a plural or a ſingular, their tranſlations being in general, and in a great variety of inſtances, extremely capricious. Let the two following be examples

Pſ. cxix. 103. מה-נמלצו לחכי אמרתך

Ως γλυκια τω λαρυγγι μου τα λογια σου

Here the Hebrew ſingular is tranſlated as if it was plural.

Jerem. i. 15. ובאו ונתנו איש כסאו

Και ηξουσι και θησουσιν εκαστος τον θρονον αυτου

Here the Hebrew anomaly is obſerved, and a maſculine ſingular is made the nominative caſe to a verb plural, ſo that nothing can be determined as to the number of a Hebrew word, from the manner in which it

is

is tranſlated by the Septuagint; and therefore there is no ſufficient reaſon for concluding the word now under conſideration to be plural, becauſe theſe tranſlators have thought fit to render it εκλεκτα, which moſt aſſuredly is not the true tranſlation of it, if the following ſhort critical examination of the paſſage ſhall be thought to be of any weight.

Firſt, then, the word חמדת is either a ſubſtantive or an adjective. In our tranſlation it is a ſubſtantive, and ſo likewiſe it is in the Hebrew, as is evident from its being *in regimine*. This it is imagined will not be diſputed.

Secondly, the word is either in the ſingular or in the plural number; in our tranſlation it is in the ſingular number, and ſo alſo it is in the Hebrew; for it is the ſingular noun חמדה with its termination changed on account of its being *in ſtatu regiminis*; and had it been plural it would have been חמדות, which it is not. As for the notion of the

vau's

vau's having been dropped as ſupplied by a point, upon mature conſideration it appears to be merely a notion, without any thing to ſupport it. The noun is certainly a noun ſubſtantive of the ſingular number, and follows the rule of other ſimilar nouns, of the feminine gender, when they are *in regimine*.

Thirdly, the noun is a ſingular ſubſtantive of the feminine gender, connected with a verb plural, according to the very frequent though anomalous uſage of the Hebrew language; thus

Hoſea ix. 7. ידעו ישראל *Iſrael ſcient.*

Thus alſo as in the paſſage already cited from

Jerem. i. 15. ובאו ונתנו איש כסאו *venient et ponent unuſquiſque ſolium ſuum.*

Thus likewiſe

Iſaiah xxv. 3. קרית גוים עריצים יירוך *Civitas Gentium fortium formidabunt te.*

And in the former part of the ſame verſe an inſtance of a ſimilar nature occurs,

על-כן יכבדוך עם-עז *Idcirco Glorificabunt te populus fortis.*

A vaſt

*A vaſt variety of other examples have been, and might be produced, to the ſame purpoſe; all tending to prove, that the anomaly of a noun ſingular, connected with a verb plural, is no uncommon thing in the Hebrew language: on the contrary, that the uſage is ſo frequent that it might almoſt be called idiomatical. Therefore the conceit of Houbigant, and of ſome others who concur with him, is wholly inadmiſſible, when they ſuggeſt that חמדת muſt be a plural noun, becauſe it is connected with a verb plural; whereas it is as clear and plain, as any thing can be, that there is no neceſſity for any ſuch thing, inaſmuch as the Hebrew language abounds with inſtances wherein a noun ſingular is connected with a verb plural. Were this paſſage in the prophecy of Haggai a ſingle ſolitary inſtance, ſomething might be

* See the Monthly Review for January, where, in a moſt ſenſible and judicious review of Biſhop Newcomb's Tranſlation of the Minor Prophets, are given many very appoſite examples.

ſaid, and with reaſon, in favour of Father Houbigant's ſuggeſtion; but when the contrary is ſo very notorious, it is rather extraordinary that a man ſo well acquainted with the Hebrew language, as he certainly was, ſhould have adopted and propagated an opinion which appears not to have the leaſt foundation in truth.

Should it be urged, as in all probability it may, by the favourers of the above opinion, that in the Hebrew anomalies, where a noun ſingular is connected with a verb plural, the noun always implies a plurality, either in itſelf, or its dependencies. Thus, nouns of number or multitude, or that imply multitude in their ſignification, are often in the ſingular number connected with verbs plural. Should any thing of this kind be urged, and it ſeems to be the whole that can be urged upon the occaſion (for the fact of the Hebrew anomalies cannot be denied), we may allow it in a great meaſure to be true. But what

what then? Will this invalidate the prophecy of Haggai? Will this exclude the paſſage, under conſideration, from coming under and being juſtified by the rule of the Hebrew Anomalies? Totally the reverſe. For in the inſtance in the prophecy, the rule of the Anomaly is as ſtrictly adhered to, and with as much propriety, and even elegance, as in any inſtance whatever that can be produced. "The deſire of all nations" is a plural deſire, and therefore in the Hebrew it is connected with a verb plural. It is not ſimply "the deſire." It is not the deſire of an individual, but it is the deſire of all nations; and therefore the word, however ſingular in itſelf, is, by its connection, rendered a plural in the higheſt degree; as plural as the ſeveral nations of the world, and the individuals of which they conſiſt.

Should it be objected from hence, that, as the deſire was ſo multiplied in its ſignification as to be the deſire of all nations, the word ought to have been expreſſed חמדות in the plural

number. The anſwer is, firſt, that the uſage of the Hebrew language juſtifies the contrary, and juſtifies alſo the joining a noun ſingular, circumſtanced as in the preſent inſtance, with a verb plural. And, ſecondly, there ſeems to have been a reaſon, and a very ſtrong reaſon, why the word is expreſſed in the ſingular number, and why it ought not to have been expreſſed in the plural; and, it is, becauſe it was characteriſtic of the Meſſiah. He was the object of the deſire, and therefore, with propriety, the word could not have been expreſſed otherwiſe than in the ſingular number, leſt mankind ſhould have been taught from thence to have expected more Meſſiahs than one. He alone was the object marked out by the Prophet, as the deſire of all nations; therefore the word, expreſſive of him, is in the ſingular number. But all nations concurred in the expectation and deſire of him; therefore was he, though only one himſelf, the multiplied deſire of the ſeveral nations of the world; and, conſequently

quently when the Prophet foretells that the Meſſiah ſhould come, and *their* deſire be accompliſhed, he uſes the verb in the plural number with a marked preciſion and propriety. The fact is certain, that the Prophet hath uſed a ſingular noun with a verb plural; and the fact is equally certain, that ſuch uſage is amply juſtified by the anomalies of the ſame kind, ſo frequent in the Hebrew language; and if this ſhould not be thought ſufficiently ſatisfactory, and the reaſon of the Prophet's departing from the regular idiom ſhould be enquired into, the reaſon ſeems to be evidently that which hath been already aſſigned. He was prophecying of the Meſſiah, but that Meſſiah was one only perſon; therefore the term by which he characteriſes him is uſed in the ſingular number, and to denote one only perſon. But then again, as the Prophet deſcribes him as the object of deſire to all the ſeveral nations of the world, therefore, when he ſays, their deſire ſhould *come*, he uſes the verb plurally, becauſe, however

the

the object of their desire was individual, the desire itself, in them, was a multiplied and plural desire.

Should these reflections, and this reasoning, in conjunction with what is related in the ensuing pages, be thought satisfactory and convincing, they will very sufficiently remove all the difficulties under which the prophecy hitherto hath been conceived to be involved. "The desire of all nations shall come" will appear certainly to have been the words of the Prophet; and "the desire of all nations" will appear as certainly to be characteristic of the Messiah, and of him only. The time also, within which he was to come, will be marked with a clearness and perspicuity that admits of no evasion. He was to come and glorify, with his Divine presence, the Temple which was building when the prophecy was delivered. But that Temple has long since been destroyed; therefore the conclusion is (must be, in the opinion of

of all who are perſuaded that Haggai was a true prophet of God, and who are not loſt to all competent uſe of their underſtanding and reaſon) the Meſſiah hath been long ſince come.

INTRODUCTORY to the evidence, intended here to be produced, of the falſehood of Joſephus's relation concerning the Temple, which, he ſays, was entirely taken down and rebuilt upon new foundations by Herod, it will be neceſſary firſt, to ſtate the reaſon of the objections which are made to his relation.

The reaſon of the objections, in a few words, is plainly this. If Joſephus's relation is true, the Prophecy of Haggai will be proved to be a falſe prophecy, for both cannot be true. The Prophecy is in theſe words: "* Thus ſaith the Lord of hoſts; Yet once, "it is a little while, and I will ſhake the "heavens, and the earth, and the ſea, and "the dry land; And I will ſhake all nations, "and the deſire of all nations ſhall come: "and I will fill this Houſe with glory, ſaith "the Lord of hoſts. The ſilver is mine, and "the gold is mine, ſaith the Lord of hoſts. "The glory of this latter Houſe ſhall be "greater than of the former, ſaith the Lord "of hoſts: and in this place will I give peace, "ſaith the Lord of hoſts." That theſe words

* Haggai ii. 6, 7, 8, 9.

were ſpoken in conſequence of the ſecond Temple, then building, and whoſe foundations had been laid under the decree of Cyrus, will not be denied; and equally undeniable is it, that they convey a promiſe that this Temple ſhould be filled with greater glory than Solomon's was. Now, let the word glory be ſuppoſed to ſignify whatever it may, either the preſence and glory of God, or ſilver, gold, and other external ornaments and decorations, it ſtill will be the ſame. If Joſephus's relation is true, the Prophecy never was fulfilled, and now never can be fulfilled, and therefore is a falſe prophecy. No one ever heard or ſaid that Haggai's Temple was more glorious in external ſplendor or magnificence than Solomon's; and moſt certain it is, if Herod took it entirely down, and built a new one in its room, before the coming of the Meſſiah, that it never was filled with a greater glory of the Lord than that which filled the temple of Solomon; for, in fact, it never had any glory of the Lord at all in it as Solomon's had. So that the matter muſt inevitably be brought to this iſſue—Either Haggai was a falſe Prophet, or Joſephus a falſe Hiſtorian. As for accommodating matters there is no ſuch thing—it is impoſſible. "I will fill THIS Houſe with glory" can never be interpreted to ſignify, I will fill the houſe

houſe which Herod ſhall build 500 years hence with glory, neither is there any metaphorical interpretation deviſeable, which will render the prophecy a true Prophecy. If Herod really did take the Temple down, and build a new one in its room, what Haggai prophecieth of the Temple then building, never had any accompliſhment. Indeed, the learned Doctor Heberden ſuggeſteth, that Haggai's Temple was equal in riches and ſplendor to Solomon's: his words are—"The veſſels of "the firſt Temple, which had been taken "away by Nebuchadnezzar, were reſtored "by Cyrus. Preſents, according to Ezra "(chap. i.) were made to the ſecond Temple "by Artaxerxes and his courtiers, as well as "by the Jews themſelves. The yearly in-"creaſe of gold and ſilver and precious ſtones, "circulating in the hands of men, the con-"ſtant improvement of arts, the increaſe of "trade among the Jews, during the time of "the ſecond Temple, and their numerous ſet-"tlements in various parts of the world, from "which they could ſend all ſorts of coſtly "preſents to Jeruſalem; all theſe conſidera-"tions make it probable, that the ſecond "Temple was in no reſpect inferior to the "firſt, except in the want of the Ark and the "Shechinah." Thus this learned Doctor, as

we find it in the *Biſhop of Waterford's Book on the Prophets*, p. 171. But what is this? At beſt it is only a conjecture of his own; and, though he calls it probable, it nevertheleſs is very far from being ſo: but, were it otherwiſe, it is yet totally inſufficient to eſtabliſh the truth of the Jewiſh Prophet. For *Haggai* doth not prophecy that the ſecond Temple ſhall be in no reſpect inferior to the firſt, but that it ſhall be greatly ſuperior to it. And therefore, except the Doctor's conjecture extended much farther than it doth, it can have no poſſible tendency towards eſtabliſhing the truth of the Prophecy, and conſequently the poſition, already laid down, will be uncontrovertible—that either *Haggai* was a falſe Prophet, or *Joſephus* a falſe Hiſtorian. That *Joſephus* was a falſe Hiſtorian—that when he ſays *Herod* intirely took down the ſecond Temple, removed all the foundations of it, laid new foundations—that he then ſaid what was moſt untrue it is imagined will be fully and ſatisfactorily proved in the following pages.

If, then, Herod really did perform what Joſephus hath aſcribed to him, then was the Temple deſtroyed by Titus as totally and intirely different from Haggai's Temple as Haggai's Temple was from Solomon's; and of courſe,

courſe, three Temples having been conſtructed, *de novo*, at Jeruſalem; the Temple which was deſtroyed by Titus was not the ſecond but the third Temple. But where, when, or by whom, Jews or Chriſtians, was it ever ſpoken of, or referred to, as a third Temple? Even Joſephus himſelf does not denominate it a third Temple; and all other writers, that have occaſion to ſpeak of it, ſpeak of it as the ſecond Temple. Would they have done ſo, and particularly the more antient writers, if they had known it to be otherwiſe? Would they have ſpoken of it as the ſecond Temple, as the Temple built by Haggai, when at the ſame time they knew it was a third Temple built by Herod, and not that which was built by Haggai? Would all the Jewiſh Doctors and Rabbies, both antient and modern, have expreſſed themſelves, as it is notorious they do expreſs themſelves, in expectation of a third Temple, to be conſtructed for the reception of the Meſſiah, whom they expect, if they had known that a third Temple had been already conſtructed, and that it was the Temple which was deſtroyed by Titus? What inducement could they poſſibly have to ſay they expected a third and not a fourth Temple, except it be that they knew, and were perſuaded, that no third Temple had ever

ever been conſtructed? This uniform concurrence in the writers of every age, and of every denomination, is a very ſtrong convincing argument that Joſephus doth not ſpeak truth, when he ſaith that Herod took away the foundations of the old, and built a new Temple in its room. But let it be ſuppoſed for a moment, that this uniform concurrence among writers took its riſe from ſome miſtake, and ſo the Jews never made, in their popular language, any nominal diſtinction between Haggai's Temple, and that which Joſephus ſays was built by Herod. Yet, when did this miſtake ariſe? Nay, how was it poſſible that it could ariſe? The Jews, when they ſaw the whole of the ſecond Temple taken down to the ground, all the foundations of it grubbed up and removed, could not poſſibly fancy that the ſecond Temple was then ſtanding, when at the ſame time they ſaw there was no Temple at all. They could not imagine, when they ſaw the Jewiſh Hiſtorian's edifice erected with different materials, and upon different foundations, that it was the very ſame building which they had, but a little before with their own eyes, ſeen pulled down to the ground, and conſequently knew that it was not the ſame building. They could not poſſibly ſay or conceive, that the

Temple

Temple at Jeruſalem had been only twice built, when, at the ſame time, they ſaw and knew (if any ſuch thing happened) that it had been built three times. Miſtakes certainly may, and often do, ariſe; but then they never ariſe without ſome cauſe, though ever ſo trifling. But here there does not appear any, even the moſt diſtant cauſe or foundation for a miſtake. They could not even ſpeak of the Temple and its conſtruction without declaring it to be a third Temple; for, as it was Herod's Temple, it was therefore not Haggai's Temple; and as Haggai's Temple was the ſecond, therefore this, which was poſterior to Haggai's, muſt be a third; and therefore, if at any time through accident they had ſpoken of it as the ſecond, their minds would naturally have revolted at the ſound, and they would have corrected themſelves, as conſcious that they had ſpoken of it in falſe terms.

But there is a ſecond argument againſt the truth of the Jewiſh Hiſtorian's relation, and it is this—If Herod really did effect what is aſcribed to him, then for a year and half, by his own account, (but it muſt have been a much longer time) there was no Temple at Jeruſalem; and of courſe there muſt have been, for that time, a ſuſpenſion of all ſacred offices.

offices *. There could be no preſentations in the Temple, for there was no Temple to be preſented in; no ſacrifices, for there was no altar on which they might be offered; no expiation could be made, for there was no Holy of Holies into which the high prieſt could enter; and, in ſhort, in what reſpected the ſacred offices, the Jews muſt for the time have been reduced to as wretched a ſtate as that in which they were under the Babyloniſh Captivity. Now, what proviſion hath Joſephus in his hiſtory made for an exigency of this kind? *Altum ſilentium*, not a ſyllable doth he ſay upon the ſubject. At the expence of truth he hath aggrandiz'd his Hero; and, forgetting what conſequences would be derived from the aggrandizement, he hath left

* The learned Dr. Prideaux (ſub anno ante Chriſtum 17.) ſuppoſes, that the Temple was not made fit for divine ſervice under nine years and an half; which ſuppoſition will render the Hiſtorian's account ſtill more extravagantly ridiculous and incredible. But in this the learned Doctor ſeems to be miſtaken, and to have been deceived by the negligent and confuſed account which the Hiſtorian has given of the matter; who ſays, that the Temple was built by the prieſts in a year and an half, and the exterior parts and porticos by Herod in eight years; not meaning hereby that Herod was eight years at work diſtinct from the time employed by the prieſts, for the works were carrying on at the ſame time, but in the whole, that the works were carrying on for eight years, and that the work of the prieſts was finiſhed in a year and an half of that time. Eight years ſurely is long enough in all conſcience for the Jews to have been without any Temple fit for divine ſervice.

the

the whole body of his countrymen for a year and half, without a poſſibility of worſhipping the God of their fathers according to his own divine law; and he hath left them patiently ſubmitting to this deplorable condition without uttering a ſingle complaint againſt it. And for whom, and for what, did they ſubmit to this? For Herod, a wretch whom they moſt entirely deteſted! and to gratify the vanity of a man, or rather a monſter, whom they would willingly have deſtroyed! Surely all this muſt be too much even for the moſt extended credulity.

But ſay that Herod really did apply to them for their conſent to take down the Temple, and to build a new one. Would they? Did they dare, ſetting every other conſideration aſide, to have given their conſent? Moſt certainly not; ſuperſtitious and ſcrupulous as the Jews are known to have been upon every the moſt trifling occaſion. Their ſuperſtition, if ſuch it may be called, muſt have ariſen to the higheſt degree upon ſuch an occaſion as this, and they never would have ſuffered a Temple, venerable upon ſo many accounts, to have been pulled down, and in a manner deſecrated, for no other imaginable end but that of gratifying Herod's pride. The Hiſtorian does not pretend that there was any ſuch defect in it

as to make it neceſſary to be all taken down; the whole that he alledges is, that it was neither ſo large nor ſo high as Solomon's. And was this a reaſon ſufficient for taking it down? Could this pretence, and no other is alledged, have induced the Jews to conſent to its demolition?—They, who valued themſelves ſo much upon having a Temple diſtinguiſhed by ſuch a number of extraordinary circumſtances, and built by divine appointment? Of this Temple it was that Iſaiah prophecied long before its foundations were laid. This was the Temple concerning which the decree of Cyrus was iſſued in conformity with the Prophecy. This the Temple that was erected under the immediate inſpection of two Prophets, Haggai and Zecariah, and concerning which it was promiſed, that the Lord of hoſts would fill it with greater glory, and conſequently that it ſhould exceed even the Temple of Solomon. Now, who that reflects on theſe circumſtances, and how even bigotted the Jews always were to their Temple, can perſuade himſelf that they would forego all theſe illuſtrious honours, and expectations, and ſurrender themſelves up to the ſollicitations of a vainglorious tyrant and alien, who was their abhorrence? Eaſy of perſuaſion muſt he indeed be who can conceive

ceive it poſſible, and much more eaſy of perſuaſion who can believe it to have been a fact.

The Hiſtorian does indeed tell us, that they demurred a little at firſt, when Herod propoſed the matter to them; and the only reaſon of the demurr which he aſſigns is—They were afraid leſt, when Herod had taken the Temple down, he ſhould not be able to build them another in its room. But, acquainted as we are with the very ſtubborn attachment of the Jews to their Temple, we may be certain this would not have been their only objection to the propoſal. It was their triumph to be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the world by the glory and privileges of their Temple, of which they could juſtly boaſt, that it was erected for them by the command of the Deity himſelf, under the immediate inſpection of his Prophets; and therefore, we may be ſure they never would have conſented to exchange this for a Temple of Herod's building, which had no promiſes annexed to it, and was unſupported by any divine ſanction. If, therefore, Herod really did make any propoſal to them of the kind mentioned by the Hiſtorian, this moſt probably would have been their firſt and immediate anſwer to him —"We will never conſent that our Temple ſhall be taken down unleſs you can produce

full and certain an authority from God for doing it, as we can ſhew you for its having been erected." Their ſecond anſwer and objection would have been—" If the Temple is taken down, we ſhall be left without any place of worſhip, and there muſt neceſſarily be a ſuſpenſion of all ſacred offices till a new one is conſtructed, and therefore we can not-not conſent to it." And their third anſwer may be, that which the Hiſtorian hath made for them. Which laſt, being the only one of the three objections which it was poſſible to obviate, he has taken no notice of the other two, which it is hardly poſſible to ſuppoſe were not made, if Herod really did make any ſuch propoſal as Joſephus hath related.

And here, having mentioned the divine authority by which the ſecond Temple was erected, will be the proper place to take notice of what Philo ſays in his embaſſy; and his evidence muſt be unexceptionable and concluſive, as it is impoſſible but he muſt have known whether the Temple at Jeruſalem, which Caligula wanted to profane, was a Temple of Herod's building, or was the Temple built under the inſpection and prophecy of Haggai; by the appointment and command of God. His words are theſe; having ſpoken of Caligula's intention of ſetting

up

up his own image in the Temple at Jeruſalem, in an apoſtrophe to him—τὶ φής· σὺ μὲν ἄνθρωπος ὢν αἰθέρα καὶ οὐρανὸν ζητεῖς περισκοπεῖν, &c. τὸν δὲ θεὸν ἐδένος τῶν ἐνταῦθα καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀξιοῖς, ἢ χώρας, ἢ πόλεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ, τὸν βραχὺν ἔτως περίβολον αὐτῷ καθιερωθέντα καὶ καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς καὶ λογίοις θεσφάτοις ἀφελέσθαι διανοῇ; "Doſt thou not think that God is worthy to partake of any thing with thee in this world, &c. but meditateſt even how to take from him his own little Temple, which hath been ſanctified and conſecrated to himſelf by his own divine oracles and prophecies?" The warmeſt partiſans of Joſephus muſt ſurely allow that theſe words are totally inapplicable to any Temple of Herod's building. Deſcriptive, and very ſtrongly deſcriptive, they moſt certainly are of the Temple which was built under the Prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, but of no other which was not as that was καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς καὶ λογίοις θεσφάτοις, therefore, they are very ſtrong and convincing evidence that when Philo wrote Haggai's Temple was ſtill ſtanding, and of courſe that it never had been taken down by Herod, in order to erect a new one in its room. And it is material here to obſerve; that, if Herod really had taken down the old Temple, Philo was of ſuch an age that he muſt have remembered it;

it; and, remembering it, he never could have ſaid that it was eſtabliſhed under the ſanction of divine oracles and prophecies; when, at the ſame time, he himſelf knew that it was entirely built without any divine oracle or prophecy at all, and purely to gratify the pride and ambition of Herod, who wanted thereby to perpetuate his own memory.

But this is not all. There is another paſſage in Philo which moſt plainly ſhews that he knew nothing of Herod's modern Temple. For, in the relation of his embaſſy, having told how certain perſons had brought the melancholly news to them of Caligula's intention of ſetting up his own image in the Temple at Jeruſalem, and the diſtreſs and aſtoniſhment it had occaſioned to them, he adds, that, when they were a little recovered, they deſired thoſe who brought the news to explain if they knew what it was that had occaſioned the Emperor to proceed to ſuch extremities. The anſwer they received he then ſets down, in which, among other things, are theſe words, ſpeaking of the Temple—*κατήχηται δὲ ὅτι καὶ πάντων ἱερῶν τῶν πανταχοῦ κάλλιόν ἐστιν ἐξ ἀπείρων χρόνων ἀπαύστοις καὶ ἀφειδέσι δαπάναις ἀεὶ προσκοσμούμενον· i. e.* "He hath been told that it is the grandeſt and moſt magnificent Temple in the world, having been continually

ally adorned and beautified through a long ſucceſſion of ages at a conſtant and boundleſs expence." Is there any perverſion of language by which theſe words can be applied to a Temple of Herod's building, which, to Philo, muſt have been ſo modern a ſtructure, only of the other day, and which, at the time of his writing, had not been finiſhed more than 44 years? But, once more—If Herod really did effect what Joſephus has aſcribed to him, one would think Agrippa, who was his grandſon, muſt have known ſomething of it; but it is very evident, from his Epiſtle to Caligula, that he was an entire ſtranger to any ſuch thing. He beſeeches him in behalf of the Temple at Jeruſalem, into which he ſays no figure made with hands was ever ἐξ ἀρχῆς ſuffered to be introduced, "Our forefathers, ſays he, having deemed it wicked, either to paint or make any image of the inviſible God." He then proceeds, and with moſt wonderful art ſuggeſts to him how extremely dangerous it would be, if he ſhould proceed to profane the Temple, by ſetting up his image in it. "Many who had no great veneration for the Temple, and would have been glad of an opportunity of violating its ſacred laws, yet dared not do it, becauſe they knew what calamitous and dreadful puniſhment had

had been inflicted on thoſe who had violated them." Herein referring to the puniſhment inflicted on Antiochus Epiphanes, who had actually done what Caligula was about to do, and had placed the image of Jupiter Olympus upon the Altar. Here then Agrippa, in pleading for the Temple that then was at Jeruſalem, and for its preſervation from being profaned, plainly intimates, that it had been profaned, and that dreadful vengeance had been the conſequence of the profanation; but he never would have intimated this of a Temple which (if it was a fact) he himſelf knew had been built by his Grandfather, and had never been profaned at all. Therefore the Temple, which then was at Jeruſalem, and which he pleaded for, was not a new Temple of Herod's building, but was the old Temple which had been erected by Haggai the Prophet, and which had ſuffered under the profanation of Antiochus Epiphanes. Moreover, if he had known that the Temple had been built by his Grandfather, in the courſe of his letter he would have mentioned, or hinted at ſomething of the kind; but not a ſyllable eſcapes him that has the leaſt tendency that way. On the contrary, when, he had ſo direct an opportunity of making the Emperor's grandfather, M. Agrippa, amongſt his other encomiums

comiums on the Temple, extol the princely magnificence of Herod in building it, he ſays nothing at all upon the ſubject, only ſignifies that he was ſo charmed with the ſtructure, the ſervices, the order of the prieſts, the ſplendid dignity of the high prieſt, &c. that he could talk of nothing elſe. Was it poſſible he could admire, and be in ſuch raptures with the Temple, and every thing belonging to it, and yet take no notice of the princely grandeur and munificence of its builder, whoſe gueſt at the ſame time he was? It cannot be, as neither can it if he had taken notice of it, that Agrippa in his letter would have ſuppreſſed the mention of it, when it tended to reflect ſo much honour on himſelf, who was the grandſon of Herod. Surely all this evidence, when well weighed, and laid together, will be ſufficient to correct the notion which has gone abroad, and ſo prevailed concerning Herod's having entirely taken down the whole of Haggai's Temple and built an entire new one in its room, upon new foundations; a notion founded on the ſingle teſtimony of Joſephus alone, who certainly does appear to ſay as much, and, if he does not, hath as certainly been miſinterpreted. It will be proper, therefore, now to take a view of, and examine minutely, the

ſeveral parts of the Jewiſh Hiſtorian's teſtimony; and if it ſhould be found upon examination that his teſtimony is abundant in irreconcileable contradictions, it is to be hoped it will never more be produced for the purpoſe of invalidating the truth of the Prophecy of Haggai. That Joſephus was very well ſkilled in the art of contradicting himſelf, (unleſs we ſuppoſe the Antiquities, and the Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War not to have been the product of the ſame pen) appears on many occaſions, of which the following is a pretty remarkable inſtance.

In the preface to his Antiquities he tells us, that he had undertaken the work for the purpoſe of accommodating the Greeks, to whom it could not but be very acceptable; and that he had thoughts, when he wrote the Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War, of prefixing to that hiſtory an account of the Jewiſh antiquities, &c. But in his preface to his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War, he tells us quite another ſtory, namely, that Ἀρχαιολογεῖν τὰ Ἰουδαίων was a very uſeleſs and unneceſſary work on many accounts; and particularly, becauſe many Jewiſh writers had before him treated of that ſubject with great preciſion and fidelity, and becauſe they had been tranſlated into the Greek language with very tolerable accuracy

and

and exactneſs. If it was a very uſeleſs and unneceſſary work for him, when he wrote the Jewiſh War, to give an account of the Jewiſh antiquities for the reaſons he here aſſigns, did not thoſe reaſons ſubſiſt as ſtrongly after he had written the Hiſtory of the War as before? And how could he ſay, in the introduction to his Antiquities, that he had had thoughts of writing and prefixing them to his Hiſtory of the War, when, in the opening of that hiſtory, he declares plainly that he never had any ſuch thoughts, becauſe it was quite unneceſſary and ſuperfluous? Perhaps there may be a method of reconciling theſe contraries; but what that method is at preſent does not appear. However, not to purſue matters of this nature any farther, let us now attend to what he ſays concerning the Temple.

In his Hiſtory of the War, then, he thus expreſſes himſelf (B. 1. ch. 21.) Πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ γὰρ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας, αὐτόν τε τὸν ναὸν ἐπεσκεύασε, καὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν, ἀνετείχισατὸ χώραν, τῆς ἴσης διπλασίαν, ἀμέτροις μὲν χρησάμενος τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν, ἀνυπερβλήτῳ δὲ τῇ πολυτελείᾳ. "Herod then, in the fifteenth year of his reign, at an immenſe expence and with moſt extraordinary magnificence both repaired the Temple itſelf and

rebuilt the wall of the area, which he enlarged to twice its former dimenſions." Here, then the Hiſtorian expreſſly ſays, that what Herod did to the Temple was done in the fifteenth year of his reign, when he was in poſſeſſion of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, as he mentions in the concluſion of the preceding chapter; when he was in ſuch high eſtimation both with Cæſar and with Agrippa, that Cæſar loved him next to Agrippa, and Agrippa preferred no one before him but Cæſar. Thus bleſſed, ſays he, his mind dilated itſelf, and he began to turn his thoughts towards works which might be for the honour of religion. In the fifteenth year therefore of his reign he both repaired the Temple &c.

Here likewiſe it is to be particularly taken notice of, that the Hiſtorian ſays expreſſly that Herod REPAIRED the Temple, for ſuch and no other in this place is the conſtruction of the word επεσκευασε—and that he then built thoſe noble porticos which were round the Temple, and repaired and ornamented the caſtle of Antonia. All this the Hiſtorian expreſſly ſays was done in the fifteenth year of Herod's reign.

In the fifth book of his Hiſtory of the War, he gives a very particular and prolix deſcription

deſcription of the Temple, and ſpeaks of the nine gates, which were ſuperbly ornamented, being plated over with gold and ſilver by Alexander, the father of Tiberius, but names not Herod, throughout the whole account, till he comes to ſpeak of the caſtle of Antonia; and this, he ſays, was ἔργον Ηρώδε βασιλέως, in which he diſplayed the magnificence of his princely ſpirit. Hence it may very fairly be concluded, that at this time the Hiſtorian knew nothing of Herod's having rebuilt the Temple; for if he had, as that would have been a much greater diſplay of his magnificent ſpirit, he ſurely would have taken notice of it, which he does not, but paſſes him over in a profound ſilence, as if he had not had any hand even in the repairs and decorations of the Temple. Beſide what has been already mentioned, it does not appear that Joſephus takes any farther notice of Herod as concerned with the Temple, except where he mentions the affair of the golden eagle, and that ſhall be conſidered by and by. Let us now turn to the Antiquities, and ſee how what he ſays there will correſpond with what has been already related.

In the tenth chapter of his Antiquities, B. xv, he tells us, that towards the concluſion

ſion of the 17th year of Herod's reign, Cæſar came into Syria; and, on the death of Zenodorus, gave Herod his tetrarchy; that Herod's felicity was at this time riſen to the greateſt height—Καῖσαρ μὲν ȣ̓δένα μετ' Αγρίππαν Ηρώδȣ προετίμησε, Αγρίππας δὲ μετὰ Καίσαρα πρῶτον ἀπεδίδȣ Φιλίας τόπον Ηρώδη—and that, after theſe things had taken place (as he ſays in the next chapter) in the 18th year of his reign, Herod undertook a work of ſome conſequence, ȣ̓ τὸ τυχὸν, which was τὸν νεὼν τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ δι' αὐτȣ κατασκευάσασθαι, μείζω τὲ τὸν περίβολον ϗ πρὸς ὕψος ἀξιοπρεπέςατον ἐγείρειν. Here, then, the firſt difficulty occurs; and it is how to reconcile what is here ſaid with the account given us by the ſame Hiſtorian, in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War. There he ſays, that in the fifteenth year he actually did repair the Temple; that then he was in poſſeſſion of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, and in the higheſt eſtimation with Cæſar and Agrippa; and here he ſays, that he did not obtain the tetrarchy till towards the concluſion of the 17th year of his reign, and that in the 18th he had his ἔργον ȣ̓ τὸ τυχὸν in contemplation only. Ingenious men have endeavoured to ſolve the difficulty, but without effect; it is a difficulty that admits of no ſolution. The Hiſtorian moſt aſſuredly contradicts himſelf.

The

The next difficulty that occurs is, that here, at leaſt in this chapter, he in plain terms ſeems to tell us, that Herod took down the whole Temple, and built a new one upon new foundations, and that it was entered upon in about two years after his firſt having had it in contemplation, i. e. in the 21ſt year of his reign. But if this is true, the account he gives in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War is falſe; for there he ſays that he only repaired the temple. How is this to be reconciled? It will not help us in the leaſt to ſuppoſe that both accounts are true; for, if they are both true, then both Herod and all the people of the Jews muſt have been out of their ſenſes, and diſtracted. In the 15th year of his reign, he repaired the Temple (ſays the Hiſtorian), and enlarged it, ſurrounded it with walls moſt ſumptuouſly built, of the magnificence of which thoſe noble porticos which were round the Temple were plain convincing evidence; and all this was done at a moſt incredible expence. Who, then, can believe that, after having done all this, after having repaired, enlarged and beautified the Temple, within the ſpace of four or five years, he would take it all down merely for the ſake of building it all up again? If any one can ſuppoſe this to be either probable

ſion of the 17th year of Herod's reign, Cæſar came into Syria; and, on the death of Zenodorus, gave Herod his tetrarchy; that Herod's felicity was at this time riſen to the greateſt height—Καῖσαρ μὲν ȣ̓δένα μετ' Αγρίππαν Ηρώδȣ προετίμησε, Αγρίππας δὲ μετὰ Καίσαρα πρῶτον ἀπεδίδȣ Φιλίας τόπον Ηρώδη—and that, after theſe things had taken place (as he ſays in the next chapter) in the 18th year of his reign, Herod undertook a work of ſome conſequence, ȣ̓ τὸ τυχὸν, which was τὸν νεὼν τȣ̃ Θεȣ̃ δι' αὐτȣ κατασκευάσασθαι, μείζω τὲ τὸν περίβολον ϗ πρὸς ὕψος ἀξιοπρεπέςατον ἐγείρειν. Here, then, the firſt difficulty occurs; and it is how to reconcile what is here ſaid with the account given us by the ſame Hiſtorian, in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War. There he ſays, that in the fifteenth year he actually did repair the Temple; that then he was in poſſeſſion of the tetrarchy of Zenodorus, and in the higheſt eſtimation with Cæſar and Agrippa; and here he ſays, that he did not obtain the tetrarchy till towards the concluſion of the 17th year of his reign, and that in the 18th he had his ἔργον ȣ̓ τὸ τυχὸν in contemplation only. Ingenious men have endeavoured to ſolve the difficulty, but without effect; it is a difficulty that admits of no ſolution. The Hiſtorian moſt aſſuredly contradicts himſelf.

The

The next difficulty that occurs is, that here, at leaſt in this chapter, he in plain terms ſeems to tell us, that Herod took down the whole Temple, and built a new one upon new foundations, and that it was entered upon in about two years after his firſt having had it in contemplation, i. e. in the 21ſt year of his reign. But if this is true, the account he gives in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War is falſe; for there he ſays that he only repaired the temple. How is this to be reconciled? It will not help us in the leaſt to ſuppoſe that both accounts are true; for, if they are both true, then both Herod and all the people of the Jews muſt have been out of their ſenſes, and diſtracted. In the 15th year of his reign, he repaired the Temple (ſays the Hiſtorian), and enlarged it, ſurrounded it with walls moſt ſumptuouſly built, of the magnificence of which thoſe noble porticos which were round the Temple were plain convincing evidence; and all this was done at a moſt incredible expence. Who, then, can believe that, after having done all this, after having repaired, enlarged and beautified the Temple, within the ſpace of four or five years, he would take it all down merely for the ſake of building it all up again? If any one can ſuppoſe this to be either

probable

probable or poſſible, it cannot be without a ſuppoſition, at the ſame time, that Herod and all his people were mad. But, moreover, if the account here given in his Antiquities be a true account, how happened it that Joſephus knew nothing of it when he wrote his Hiſtory of the War? He certainly knew as much of Herod's hiſtory then as he did afterwards, at leaſt upon ſo very remarkable an occaſion as this. If he could know that Herod at an incredible expence had repaired and enlarged the Temple, he certainly muſt have known if it was a fact, that he had enlarged and built the Temple all new from the ground at his own expence; and if he knew it, what poſſible inducement could he have for ſuppreſſing his knowledge of it? When he mentions Herod's having repaired and enlarged the Temple, he mentions it as a work ευσεβειας, and that did great honour to his character; but ſurely, if he had known any thing of his having done more than repair the Temple he would have told it, as reflecting greater honour on his character, but he ſays nothing of it, nor gives the ſlighteſt intimation of any ſuch thing. Therefore the account of the tranſaction, given in the Antiquities becomes the leſs credible. But let us attend a little to the account he gives

he gives us in his Antiquities, B. xv. ch. 2. "In the 18th year of his reign, Herod formed the deſign καταſκευάσαθαι μείζω τὸν περίβολον of enlarging the Temple of God, and of raiſing it to a greater and becoming height; but, finding that the people did not readily concur with him in approving his deſign, he aſſembled them together, and addreſſed them in a formal harangue." In words to this effect the Hiſtorian introduces the account he is going to give us of Herod's operations on the Temple, where obſerve that he neither ſays nor intimates that Herod had formed a deſign of taking down the old Temple and building a new one in its room; for, though interpreters have rendered καταſκευάσαθαι, ædificare, ut ædificatum iret, &c. the word here hath no ſuch ſignification.

After the introduction he ſets down the words of his Hero's harangue, and neither in this doth he make him talk as if it was his intention to take the Temple down and build a new one. He tells the Jews, "that their fathers, after their return from Babylon, built this Temple to the Supreme God, but that it was by no means equal to the Temple which had been built by Solomon; for beſides that it was not ſo large, it wanted ſixty cubits of being as high as that was. That they were not to be blamed on account of this defect,

for they were reſtrained by Cyrus and Darius Hyſtaſpes in its firſt foundations; and afterwards, through a variety of cauſes, had no opportunity of making it ſuch as it ought to have been, and equal to the Temple of Solomon. But now, ſays he, I having obtained the kingdom, being in a ſtate of profound peace, and particularly in friendſhip with the Romans; being in poſſeſſion of great wealth, and a very large revenue, will endeavour to rectify thoſe defects in the Temple, which were derived from the neceſſity and ſervitude of former times," &c. Here then it is to be obſerved, that neither the Hiſtorian himſelf, nor Herod in the harangue which the Hiſtorian has made for him, ſay a word that can be interpreted of taking down the Temple which their fathers had built, and of erecting a new one in its room; and therefore the reader cannot help being very much ſurpriſed when he finds, in the Hiſtorian's next paragraph, that he repreſents the Jews aſtoniſhed at what Herod had ſaid to them, and frightened out of their wits, leſt when he had taken the Temple down, he ſhould not have wherewithal to build them another; whereas he had not ſaid a ſyllable to them about taking it down. How therefore they could put ſuch a conſtruc-

tion

tion upon his words is difficult to ſay. Certain it is, the Hiſtorian ſeems to tell us they did put this conſtruction upon them, and that Herod, in return, engages to them ὅ πρότερον καθαιρήσειν τὸν νεὼν that he will not take down the Temple till he has got every thing ready for finiſhing it completely again; and therefore it is to be ſuppoſed the words of Herod were intended to ſignify what the Jews apprehended them to ſignify, although the words themſelves appear not to have the leaſt tendency towards any ſuch ſignification. Upon ſuch a ſubject as this it is difficult to know what to ſay.

After then he has told us that every thing was ſettled between Herod and the Jews, concerning the plan of operations, he next informs us in theſe words—Ἀνελὼν δὲ τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίους καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἑτέρας ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε, μήκει μὲν ἑκατὸν ὄντα πηχῶν, τὸ δὲ ὕψος εἴκοσι περιτῆς, ἃς τῷ χρόνῳ σειζησάντων τῶν θεμελίων ὑπεθη. Whatever the Hiſtorian might have intended to ſignify by theſe words, the common interpretation put upon them is, that "having removed the old foundations, and laid others upon them, he built the Temple one hundred cubits in length, and in height, twenty more; but theſe in time, as the foundation ſettled, gave way." And what-

ever may be ſaid on the ſubject of the twenty cubits having failed through ſome defect in the foundation, which architects in general conceive improbable to have happened, this paſſage is nevertheleſs thought to be plain evidence that Herod did not merely repair, but that he did actually rebuild the Temple, *de novo*; which is ſuppoſed to be farther confirmed by what the Hiſtorian ſays in the concluſion of this chapter, where his words are to this effect: "Now the Temple having been built by the prieſts in a year and ſix months, all the people were filled with gladneſs, and returned thanks to God for the quick deſpatch with which it was finiſhed, and for the King's attention to them; with much feſtivity celebrating τὴν ἀνάκτισιν the feaſt of the new building." He then adds ſomething that muſt appear very extraordinary: He ſays, "the King upon this occaſion offered up a ſacrifice of three hundred oxen, and others offered according to their ability, but what he could not ſay:" ἐκφεύγει γὰρ τὸ δύνασθαι πρὸς ἀλήθειαν εἰπεῖν—*i. e.* he had forgot: and he finiſhes his chapter with ſomething perhaps ſtill more extraordinary —"It is reported, that at that time, when the Temple was building, no rain fell in the day, but only in the night-time ſome gentle

gentle ſhowers, ſo that the work met with no interruption; καὶ τοῦτον λογον οἱ πατερες ἡμιν παρεδωκαν and this tradition our forefathers have handed down to us." Is it uſual for people to talk of events as it were of yeſterday being handed down to them by tradition? And then, as a finiſhing ſtroke, he ſays of this wonderful event—"This is not at all incredible, if any one will reflect on the many other diſplays of his favour towards us, which God hath made in our behalf." But what occaſion for this reflecting, if it was a fact? Many of Joſephus's own relations, who were alive at the time, muſt have known it to be ſo, and he might have alledged them in teſtimony of its truth, without any of this parade. Nay, it is not impoſſible, that, when this account was written, ſome perſons might have been ſtill alive who remembered the whole tranſaction, and conſequently he might have had living evidences to have appealed to for the truth of it. But, alaſs! it all ſo very ſtrongly *olet mendacium*, that this ſingle circumſtance which he has recorded is ſufficient of itſelf alone to deſtroy the credit of his whole account. However, for the preſent, let us ſuppoſe this circumſtance not to have been recorded, and that the Hiſtorian has very ſatisfactorily aſſured us,

us, that *Herod had taken down the old Temple, and erected another new and very ſplendid one, upon new foundations, to be an eternal monument* πρὸς αἰώνιον μνήμην *of his munificence.*

Let us now examine how what he ſays farther concerning Herod will correſpond with this account. It ſeems then (B. xvii. ch. 6.) that the King having provided a very valuable offering, namely, a large golden eagle; it was placed over the great gate of the Temple. This giving great offence to two very celebrated and popular doctors among the Jews, they ſuggeſted to their diſciples that this eagle was erected contrary to the law, which did not allow them to make or conſecrate an image of any kind whatſoever, and that it ought to be deſtroyed. Fired by theſe ſuggeſtions of their teachers, and a report having been ſpread that the King was dead, the young men go without any heſitation into the Temple, pull the Eagle down, and chop it in pieces. Upon this occaſion Herod convenes an aſſembly of all the chief perſons among the Jews; and when they were met, he upbraids them with their ill behaviour—"He bids them reflect on what he had undergone for their ſakes; and, to benefit them, how largely he had contributed towards the repairs of the Temple,

by

by an expence which none of the Haſamonæan kings, during the 125 years of their reigns, were equal to—That he had ornamented the Temple with preſents of great value, and which ought not to be forgotten; and that he was in hopes they would have been a means of perpetuating an honourable memorial of himſelf, even after he was dead." Is this the language of a man who, if the Hiſtorian is rightly interpreted, built the Temple from the very foundations all at his own expence? Would ſuch an one ſay only, and here it is reported to be all that he did ſay concerning it, that they ſhould recollect τῦ ναῦ τὴν κατασκευὴν— Why did he not ſay τὴν ανάκτισιν; Would a man, who had built the whole Temple new from the ground, bid them reflect on the *rich preſents which he had made to the Temple?* The thoughts of the preſents he had made to the Temple would have been all loſt in the greater preſent he had made them of the Temple itſelf. And moreover, would that very man, who is before repreſented as building the whole Temple, *de novo*, for an eternal monument of his own munificence —ὡρὸς αιώνιον μνήμην—would he ſay, as he is here repreſented, that he was in hopes *the preſents he had made to the Temple* would have perpetuated

tuated the memorial of himſelf, even after his death?—κἄν μετα θάνατον μνήμην τε αὐτȣ̃ καὶ εὔκλειαν. But beſides all this, there is another very material part of his addreſs to them, which ſeems plainly to diſcover what the Hiſtorian (if indeed ſuch was his deſign) endeavoured to conceal.

When he bids them reflect on τȣ̃ ναȣ̃ κατασκευὴν, he tells them, that "during the 125 years that the Haſamonæan Kings reigned, they had never been able to do any thing like this for the honour of God." What, in the name of goodneſs, had theſe kings to do, to be introduced here upon ſuch a ſubject as this? They had never built a new Temple to God, or attempted it, or even had thought of ſuch a thing: why, therefore, are they thus brought into the compariſon? The Jews knew very well that thoſe kings had never built them a new Temple, and (if it was a fact) that Herod had; and therefore it appears to have been a very uſeleſs buſineſs, and quite foreign to the matter in hand, for him to ſay, that during the whole period that they reigned, they had not been able to do what they never attempted, or even thought of doing; and yet, at the ſame time, by his introducing them in this manner, and comparing himſelf with them, as he does, it

ſeems

ſeems there muſt have been ſome very ſubſtantial reaſon for it. By his bringing them thus into the compariſon, it preſuppoſes that theſe kings had been great benefactors to the Jews, and to their Temple; and that he, during the ſhort time that he had reigned over them, had done more than they had been able to do in 125 years. It is a tacit acknowledgment, likewiſe, that their benefactions had been of a ſimilar nature with his own. But their benefactions, it is certain, did not conſiſt in building a new Temple, and therefore neither did his. They had built the caſtle adjoining to the Temple, which they called *Baris*, but he ταυτην την βάριν ὀχυρωτέραν κατεσκευάσε. They had ornamented and repaired the Temple, but Herod τεν περὶ αὐτὸν ἀνετειχίσατο χώραν, της ἔσης διπλασίαν ἀμέτροις μεν χρησάμενος τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν, &c. Moreover, if Herod really had done as he is conceived to have done, that is, if he had taken down the whole Temple, removed all the foundations of it, laid new ones upon a much larger ſcale, and built them up a new and ſplendid Temple, all at his own expence; he then not only would have done more than the Haſamonæan kings had done, but more then ever had been done for them ſince the time of Solomon. How idle then muſt it

have been for him to have alledged that he had done more for them than theſe kings, when at the ſame time he had outdone all that ever went before him, Solomon only excepted?

Who can give any tolerable account of this? Who can aſſign any ſufficient reaſon why Herod, in a ſpeech wherein he endeavours to enhance the value of his benefactions, ſhould uſe a language that did not in any degree expreſs the value of them, rather than uſe a language that did? Therefore, upon the whole, this paſſage appears to be ſo palpably adverſe to the notion that has prevailed, of Herod's having built the Temple at Jeruſalem, that we are compelled to ſuppoſe, that either the Hiſtorian in his account of the buſineſs hath expreſſed himſelf with inaccuracy, or that he has wilfully and deſignedly told a direct falſhood; either that his relation is not true, or ſo negligently expreſſed as to be liable to misinterpretation.

It has been already obſerved, that in the time of Caligula it was not known that the Temple at Jeruſalem was of Herod's building, and at his expence. Caligula had heard a very different account of it; that it was raiſed to the ſplendor in which it then was by

by the liberality of a long ſucceſſion of ages. Agrippa, likewiſe, who was grandſon to Herod, it appears plainly, knew nothing of this famous exploit of his Grandfather; he underſtood that the ſame Temple was then ſtanding which had been profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes, and therefore could not have been built by his Grandfather. And Philo, who was of ſuch an age that he muſt himſelf have remembered the building of it, if Herod had built it, yet moſt clearly ſhews that he knew nothing at all of any ſuch thing; on the contrary, by his ſaying that the Temple, which was ſtanding when he wrote his Embaſſy, was καθωσιωμένον χρησμοῖς ϗ λογίοις θεσφάτοις, he proves as plainly as man can do, that does not uſe the very words that the *Temple at Jeruſalem was not built by Herod:* Conſentient with theſe teſtimonies, is likewiſe the teſtimony even of Joſephus himſelf, and of all later writers. For in his Hiſtory of the War (B. VI, ch. 4.) he ſays, that from the firſt building of the Temple by Solomon, to the deſtruction which happened in the ſecond year of the Emperor Veſpaſian, were one thouſand one hundred and thirty years, ſeven months and fifteen days: but from the laſt building of it, which was done by Haggai in the ſecond year of

Cyrus Ἀτιὸ δὲ της ὕςερον ην ἔτει δευτέρῳ Κύρε βασιλευόντος ἔποιήσατο Ἀγγαῖος &c. to the deſtruction of it by Veſpaſian, were ſix hundred and thirty nine years and forty five days. Plainer teſtimony than this need not be required.

The Hiſtorian himſelf declares in undiſguiſed terms, that he knew only of two buildings of the Temple; the one by Solomon, the other by Haggai; and, as he tells us that Haggai's was the laſt, therefore no third Temple was ever built: conſequently none was ever built by Herod. It is material here to obſerve, that the Hiſtorian, when he ſpeaks of Haggai's Temple, uſes the word ὕςερὸν, and not δευτερον; and it is well known that ὕςερὸν, uſed adverbially with the article, generally ſignifies the laſt of any thing about which it is uſed, and in this place certainly doth; and therefore there is no room for any ſalvo, or for explaining it away. The Hiſtorian certainly hath uſed a term which determines Haggai's to have been the laſt Temple that ever was built at Jeruſalem, and therefore all that hath been ſaid concerning Herod's Temple muſt be a fiction. Hence Joſephus, when he ſaith that Herod removed the foundations of Haggai's Temple, and built a new one upon other foundations, muſt be a falſe Hiſtorian, and no credit ought to be

be given to him in oppoſition to the Prophet. If what he ſays is true, the Prophet is no true Prophet; but, from the evidence here produced, it is moſt plain that what he ſays is not true, for it is contrary to the teſtimony of all thoſe antients, who ſay that it was the ſecond Temple that was deſtroyed by Titus. It is contrary to the evidence produced from Philo. It is contrary to our own reaſon likewiſe, which will not ſuffer us to admit ſo improbable a fact, as that the Jews would conſent to have a Temple, ſo circumſtanced as was the ſecond, with ſuch privileges and promiſes annexed to it, pulled down, merely to gratify the pride of Herod, and be left, till it was rebuilt, without a poſſibility of worſhipping the God of their Fathers, according to his divine law; and laſtly, what the Hiſtorian ſays is not true, becauſe it is in direct contradiction to the evidence which he himſelf hath given. Hence, then, we may fearleſsly aſſert the truth of the Prophet Haggai, and affirm that the *Meſſiah's preſence did add to the glory of the Temple which was building in the time of Haggai*; for that Temple was never pulled down till it was deſtroyed by Titus.

Let us now proceed to conſider matters in another point of view. Hitherto the Hiſto-

rian

rian has been presumed really to say what his interpreters have ascribed to him; and he has been argued against as if he really did say what they have ascribed to him. But it is now time that we proceed to enquire whether he doth indeed say what they have ascribed to him, and whether the whole is not a blunder derived from inattention in the interpreters of Josephus, and from the lax, confused, contradictory, and even romancing account which he himself hath given us of this matter in his Antiquities.

The chief argument in proof of Herod's having entirely new built the Temple, is drawn from these words, which have been already noticed—Ἀνελὼν δὲ τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίας καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἑτέρας ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε &c. Nothing, it is thought, can be more plain, more intelligible, and more positive, than these words. If Herod took away all the old foundations, and built a Temple upon new ones, what more decisive determination can there be of his having new built the Temple? It must be acknowledged, if the words are to be interpreted as they generally are interpreted, nothing can be more decisive. But let us enquire whether the words are truly interpreted or not; and, for this purpose, once more recollect the preceding

part

part of the Hiſtorian's relation. After having told us that Herod had formed the deſign of enlarging and raiſing the Temple of God to a proper height, he introduces him haranguing the Jews, and telling them what it was his deſign to do.—That it was his deſign to remedy thoſe defects in the Temple which had proceeded from the neceſſity and ſervitude of former times, and to enlarge and heighten it, ſo as to render it equal in its dimenſions to the firſt Temple. A great and arduous undertaking certainly, and what ſtartled the Jews exceedingly, as imagining he never would be able to accompliſh it. However, the Hiſtorian tells us, he ſoon ſatisfied them, ſo that they very cheerfully came into his ſcheme. After this, in the opening of his next ſection, we are informed, in the words already cited—"Now, when he had removed the old foundations and laid others, he built the Temple upon them one hundred cubits in length, &c." Who can read this without perplexity and aſtoniſhment, if he ſuppoſes the words to ſignify as they are generally interpreted to ſignify? The intention of Herod, and the propoſal he made to the Jews, was, that he would remedy the defects of the Temple, and raiſe and lengthen it: but here we have him all

at

at once grubbing up the foundations, and laying new ones. What! did not Herod know that a houſe might be lengthened without pulling it down, and grubbing up the foundations? Was the addition of an attic ſtory to a building a piece of architecture unknown in his days? Wonderful and aſtoniſhing this is! But moreover—How happens it that the Hiſtorian is ſo abrupt in his account? Without ſaying a ſyllable of the Temple's having been taken down, he begins by telling us that Herod took away the foundations. Surely the Hiſtorian ought to have made a little room for getting at the foundations before he had been in ſuch a hurry to remove them. One would have thought he ſhould have removed the edifice firſt, and not have gone to work directly upon the foundations, with the edifice (for any thing he ſays to the contrary) all reſting upon them. This ſurely is very extraordinary, and by no means after the way of other Hiſtorians. But, beſides all this,—If the edifice was to be taken down, what occaſion could there be for removing the foundations? This was a uſeleſs and moſt unneceſſary piece of expence; for, as the Temple was not to be widened, there could be no manner of occaſion for removing the foundations, which certainly

certainly muſt have been good, and better than any Herod could have laid in their room, as having been thoroughly ſettled, and preſerved from injury, by the edifice that was upon them. Every one that has but a ſmattering in architecture knows this; and therefore it is moſt truly unaccountable, if it was a fact, that Herod removed all the well-ſettled uninjured foundations of the Temple, for the ſake of laying others in their room, which would not, nor poſſibly could, be half ſo good. The language, likewiſe, which the Hiſtorian uſes upon this occaſion, is remarkable, and very ſuſpicious— "Herod, when he had removed the OLD foundations." Why does he ſay Ἀρχαίας, and not τὰ ναῷ θεμελίας, or ſomething equipollent to it, and that would not have rendered his phraſeology inelegant?—Why muſt the foundations that *then were* to the Temple be called ἀρχαίας; Ἀρχαίας ſeems to imply that the foundations, through the injuries of time, were decayed and worn out; which could not poſſibly have been the caſe here; as, by the fabrick's having continued upon them, they had been preſerved from injury: ſo that this likewiſe, in the common mode of interpretation, appears to be an inexplicable difficulty in the Hiſtorian's account. There is another difficulty

culty likewiſe occurs, which, if the common mode of interpretation is juſt, is equally inexplicable: for, after having told us that Herod having removed the old foundations, &c. he proceeds to inform us, not, as one would have expected, how *Herod* built the Temple, but, in a very different ſtile, ὠκοδομήθη δὲ ὁ ναὸς, "now the Temple was built," &c. and then goes on deſcribing ſome of the ornaments of it; and at length, introducing Herod again, he expreſſes himſelf in theſe very remarkable words—περιελάμβανε δὲ κύκλῳ μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα, πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων, καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τῶν πρὶν ὑπερβαλλόμενος ὡς ἂν ἄλλος τις εδόκει τὸν νάον ἐπικεκοσμηκέναι—"He ſurrounded the whole Temple with vaſt porticos, taking the utmoſt care that they ſhould be in very exact proportion; and outdoing all that ever went before him in the ſums he expended upon the occaſion, inſomuch that not one of his predeceſſors ſeems to have *added ſo much to the beauty of the Temple as he did.*" Who is able to reconcile this paſſage with common ſenſe, if Herod really had taken down the whole of Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room? How is it poſſible that the Hiſtorian could ſay this, if in the compaſs only of a few preceding lines he thought he had inſinuated that Herod had new built the

the Temple. His predeceſſors could not poſſibly have added any thing to the beauty of the Temple if it was all of Herod's building. And he could not poſſibly have *added more to the beauty of the Temple than any of his predeceſſors*, if there was no Temple at that time ſtanding which had been beautified by his predeceſſors; but if he entirely new built the Temple, there certainly was none; and then what meaning is there in the above words? And therefore to reſcue the Hiſtorian from ſuch palpable nonſenſe, it muſt be abſolutely pronounced that Herod did not entirely new build the Temple, and that the Hiſtorian no where ſays he did, but the contrary; and that Ανελων τὲς αρχαιὲς θεμελιὲς relates to ſomething that is totally foreign from the interpretation that has been generally put upon the words.

It is to be remembered, then, that when Haggai's Temple was built, the decree which authoriſed the building it, directed that it ſhould be preciſely upon the ſame ſpot where the former Temple had ſtood, only reſtraining it as to its length and height: it was to be only ſixty cubits in length, ſo that there were forty cubits of the ground plot of the former Temple left unbuilt upon. Now it does not appear, by any account we have in

hiſtory of the deſtruction of the firſt Temple, that the foundations of it were at all meddled with at the time of its being deſtroyed. Neither does it appear, by any account we have in hiſtory of the building of the ſecond Temple, that the builders diſturbed any more of the foundations of the firſt Temple than was neceſſary in order to erect a ſecond, of the dimenſions directed by the decree. Hence, as they were directed to build their Temple only ſixty cubits in length, it is to be preſumed that they left the remaining forty cubits of the former foundation undiſturbed, and that theſe ſo continued till the days of Herod. And this preſumption, as it ſhould ſeem, muſt ſtand good till the contrary can be made appear; i. e. till it can be proved that the foundations of the firſt Temple were all entirely removed, either by the Babylonians, or by the Jews themſelves at the building of the ſecond Temple, or in ſome ſubſequent period. Now, then, forty cubits of the foundation of the firſt Temple, remaining when Herod had projected his plan of lengthening the Temple to its firſt dimenſions, and he purpoſing to continue the building upon the ſame ground plot as Solomon's was; therefore it was neceſſary that either he ſhould erect his new building upon the

the old foundations, or lay new ones; but it is to be concluded, that the old foundations were now become totally unfit for his purpoſe, having been expoſed for ſuch a ſeries of years to the ravages of time and weather, and other accidents; and therefore it became neceſſary for him to remove theſe old foundations, and to lay new ones in their room, and to build upon them: and ſo the Hiſtorian tells us he did; for Ανελὼν τὰς ἀρχαίας θεμελίας &c. Hence, then, the argument derived from theſe words, in order to prove that Herod entirely took down Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room becomes ſuperceded, as they do not appear to have any relation to the foundations of Haggai's Temple, but to thoſe *old* foundations which remained unbuilt upon in the ground plot of Solomon's Temple. Hence our wonder ceaſes at the Hiſtorian for beginning his account with telling us that Herod removed the foundations without having previouſly ſaid a ſyllable of his having taken down the edifice that was upon them. Hence we ſee the reaſon why he calls the foundations ἀρχαίας. Hence likewiſe we underſtand him when he tells us almoſt in the ſame breath that Herod added more to the beauty and ornaments of the Temple than any of his predeceſſors

ceſſors. And hence alſo we ſee how what he did was in conformity with what the Hiſtorian had before told us he intended to do. And moreover this enables us to account for the language he uſes on occaſion of the affair of the Golden Eagle, and ſerves in ſome meaſure to reconcile what he hath here ſaid in this chapter of his Antiquities with what he had before ſaid upon the ſame ſubject in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War; whereas, if the received interpretation is ſuppoſed to ſtand good, the Hiſtorian becomes abſurd, irreconcileable with himſelf, and altogether inexplicable. He makes Herod entirely new build the Temple; and yet, at the ſame time, he has told us that he only repaired it. He makes him add more to the beauties of *his own new built Temple* than any of his *predeceſſors* had done. He makes him remove the foundations of a building before he had taken down the building itſelf. He makes him put himſelf to the moſt wanton unneceſſary expence imaginable, by removing foundations in order to lay others juſt in the ſame place, which would not be half ſo good as thoſe he had taken away; with a hundred other inexplicable abſurdities and contradictions.

But doth not the Hiſtorian tell us, that after Herod had made his propoſal, the Jews were

were exceedingly anxious and uneaſy, fearing leſt, when he had ſet about καταλῦσαι το πᾶν ἔργον, he ſhould not be able to finiſh what he had propoſed. It is certain that the Hiſtorian doth ſpeak to this effect, and equally certain, that, by the courteſy of tranſlators, καταλῦσαι το πᾶν ἔργον is rendered "taking down the whole Temple;" whereas the words, neither by neceſſity nor implication, ſignify any ſuch thing. Το πᾶν ἔργον ought to be tranſlated, *all that he intended*, or *all that was neceſſary on the occaſion*, for they certainly do not ſignify the *whole Temple*. But if they do not ſignify the whole Temple, what meaning is there in the words that follow? Does not Herod there engage that he will not καθαιρήσειν τὸν νεὼν take down the Temple till he got every thing ready for finiſhing it again? He doth ſay ſo; but let it be obſerved, that he doth not ſay τὸν ἅπαντα νεὼν, which he could ſay, when he tells us that Herod ſurrounded it στοαῖς μεγίσταις; ſo that it is evident that, in the Hiſtorian's ſtyle, there is a difference between τὸν νεὼν and τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα. Here, then, let it be conſidered, that in order to accompliſh what Herod had propoſed, it was neceſſary to take down the end wall of the Temple, in order to effect a junction with, and accommodate the new building to it. Let it be farther conſidered, that, as he was not

not only to lengthen but to raiſe ſome part of the Temple higher than it was before, he muſt of courſe be obliged to take down ſome of the upper works of the Temple. Theſe then ſeem to be the things which he refers to, when he ſays that he will not καθαιρήσειν τὸν νεὼν till he has got every thing ready for finiſhing it again; and as the words do by no neceſſity of interpretation ſignify that he would take down the whole Temple, we may aſſuredly conclude that theſe were the whole of what he referred to in his engagement to the Jews. But, once more. The Hiſtorian ſays, τῷ δὲ ναῷ διὰ των ἱερέων οἰκοδομηθέντος ἐνιαυτῳ καὶ μηνιν ἓξ—"the whole people were filled with gladneſs." If by theſe words he means to inſinuate that the whole Temple from its foundations was completed in 18 months, a more palpable, more impoſſible falſhood never fell from the pen of any writer; a falſhood which it is not worth while criticiſing on, and which every reader muſt immediately, and without the leaſt heſitation, reject with the utmoſt diſdain, as an inſult upon his underſtanding: but if referred to the work of raiſing the Temple to a greater height, (which work moſt probably was given in charge to the prieſts to perform, as Herod, not being a prieſt himſelf, was excluded from having any thing to do

in

in that buſineſs) it then may come within the reach of probability and truth; and the purport of the paſſage will be, that the prieſts having completely finiſhed the buſineſs of raiſing the walls of the Temple, and of covering it in, the people were filled with gladneſs upon the occaſion, and celebrated it with much feſtivity and rejoicing. The concluding paſſage of this chapter is in theſe words—τὰ μεν ὖν περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐξῳκοδομήθη τῦτον τὸν τρόπον—ſtrange language this, if it is to ſignify—"In this manner was the Temple new built, and completely finiſhed;" and yet ſuch muſt be its ſignification, if the received interpretation of Joſephus is juſt, in what reſpects the Temple; and as it is impoſſible the words can have any ſuch ſignification, therefore it is a plain proof that the received interpretation is not juſt. The true literal conſtruction is: "In this manner were the buildings about the Temple (or that related to the Temple) completed;" which no more implies that the Temple had been entirely taken down and new built, than it implies any thing elſe with which the words have no connection; but is very ſtrongly expreſſive of repairs and additional buildings; and the Hiſtorian could not have uſed more ſignificant terms in which to have expreſſed as

 much.

much. He had before told us that Herod had enlarged the dimenſions of the Temple by adding forty cubits to its length; that he had been at the expence of raiſing it, where it was neceſſary, to a becoming height; a work which, as it ſeems, was entruſted to the prieſts; that he had ornamented and decorated it beyond any thing that any of his predeceſſors had done; that the work of the prieſts was finiſhed in a year and half, and that the other works, relating to the porticos, and exterior parts, were built in eight years; and then concludes his account, as above mentioned: "In this manner were the buildings that related to the Temple completed." Why does he ſay τα μεν ὂν περὶ τὸν ναὸν; Why does he not ſay ὁ μεν ὂν ναὸς ἐξῳκοδομήθη τοῦτον τὸν τροπὸν; Why indeed, except becauſe he knew it was falſe, and that he had inſinuated no ſuch thing in the preceding relation. So that, upon the whole, and without entering into any farther diſcuſſion of this matter, if the reader gives any credit to what has been already ſuggeſted, it will appear that the whole affair of Herod's new Temple is a mere fiction; not of the Hiſtorian, but derived from the negligent blundering manner in which he has been interpreted. It is true, indeed, the Hiſtorian hath himſelf contributed

towards

towards leading his interpreters into this miſtake, by the negligent manner in which his relation is written; and it is very poſſible that his negligence was not without a deſign of miſleading his readers, and making them think greater things of Herod than he himſelf durſt affirm of him; and particularly of miſleading the Greeks and Romans, for whoſe amuſement he wrote his Antiquities. Some of theſe he certainly did impoſe upon; and from them, it is to be preſumed, the notion of Herod's new Temple has been handed down to our times.

The learned having taken things upon truſt, without examination, have followed one another in a direct line; juſt as certain birds do when they are engaged in a long flight, where the firſt breaks the air, and the reſt follow, without the trouble of opening a path-way for themſelves; whereas if any of thoſe great and learned perſons, who have ſo quietly acquieſced in the notion of Herod's new Temple, would but have been at the pains of examining the Hiſtorian's account, they muſt inevitably have ſeen that he was either falſe, or miſinterpreted. In his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War, as already cited, he tells us in the plaineſt terms imaginable, that no third Temple was ever built at Jeruſalem, becauſe

he ſays Haggai's was the laſt. In terms likewiſe that cannot be miſtaken, he tells us, in that hiſtory, that Herod only repaired the Temple. In that hiſtory alſo he gives a long prolix deſcription of the Temple, but aſcribes none of it to Herod, nor even names him as having had any concern in any thing belonging to it, except the caſtle of Antonia. Ought not every thing then that he wrote afterwards in his Antiquities, which was not conſonant with this hiſtory, to have been looked upon with a jealous eye? Why was more credit due to him in his Antiquities, than in his Hiſtory of the Jewiſh War? In his Antiquities, when he goes directly contrary to what he had before written on the ſame ſubject in his Hiſtory of the War, for the moſt part, he gives no notice that he is correcting himſelf; or that he is ſupplying the defects or omiſſions in what he had written before, but boldly, and without heſitation, aſſerts juſt as it may ſeem to make for his purpoſe, or as the humour might take him. Thus, in the 12th book of his Antiquities, he ſays in expreſs terms, that Antiochus took the city of Jeruſalem without reſiſtance — ἀμαχητι λαμβανει την πόλιν, which is not only in direct contradiction to the matter of fact, but in direct contradiction likewiſe to what he had himſelf

ſelf before written, in his Hiſtory of the War (B. 1. C. 1.) And here likewiſe, if indeed he does ſay any thing to that effect, that Herod pulled down Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room, it is in direct contradiction to what he ſays in his Hiſtory of the War, for there he ſays Herod only repaired it.

Joſephus, in his Hiſtory of the War, is certainly to be much eſteemed as a very valuable Hiſtorian, but in his Antiquities he by no means appears under the ſame character. In them he is fabulous to a great degree; he falſifies records, and then retails his falſhoods as truths. He retails as facts figments merely of his own invention, for the purpoſe of aggrandizing his people, and making them appear to be of greater conſequence in the eyes of the Romans; and where any fact if related would have reflected any diſgrace upon them, or would have been ridiculed and made a jeſt of by the Heathen, there he ſuppreſſes the mention of it. Theſe things are ſo very well known to the readers of Joſephus, that it is hardly worth while to refer to any particular inſtances; one or two however may be mentioned juſt for the ſake of verifying what is here

here ſaid. In the firſt book of Samuel xviii. 25. we are told, that Saul ordered David to bring him an hundred foreſkins of the Philiſtines: but Joſephus, knowing how odd this would ſound in the ears of the Romans, with whom *curtus Judæus* was always a ſubject of much jeſt and ridicule, tells us that Saul required of him κεφαλὰς αὐτων ἑξακοσίας (Antiq. vi. 10.) The golden calf he ſuppreſſes all mention of, as he does likewiſe of Herod's cruelty in the maſſacre of the innocents. From the mint of his own invention, moſt probably, he contrived and framed that pretty ſtory which he has related (Ant. xi. 8.) concerning Alexander, and the great reſpect which he ſhewed to the Jewiſh high prieſt, a circumſtance recorded or hinted at by no other hiſtorian whatſoever, but that certainly had its tendency towards making the Jews appear of ſome conſequence in the eyes of the heathen. And laſtly, what more notorious falſhood was ever uttered than that which we find in his ſecond book againſt Apion (λγ) where he ſays Ἄντιχρυς ἡμῖν ὁ νομοθέτης ἀπεῖρηκεν, "our Lawgiver hath expreſsly forbidden us to make a jeſt of or ſpeak diſreſpectfully of the gods of other nations;" and the ſame he inculcates in his Antiquities, iv. 8. but more fully: for there he plainly ſignifies that the Jews

Jews were prohibited by the law from abuſing the idols of the heathens, or deſtroying their temple, which he muſt have very little knowledge of the Jewiſh law who doth not know to be moſt ſupremely falſe. Now he that could pervert and falſify in ſo poſitive a law of his own religion, for the purpoſe of ingratiating himſelf and his people with the heathen, we may be certain would not be more ſcrupulous in matters of a different nature; and therefore, when his interpreters ſaw him aſcribing, as they thought, to Herod what it is impoſſibie could be true, if they had received it at all, they ought to have received it as problematical; whereas they have ſwallowed it all greedily as truth; have reaſoned from it as from a fact, and have endeavoured to accomodate to it the generally received opinion, received by Jews, Heathens and Chriſtians; that the Temple at Jeruſalem which was deſtroyed by Titus wat the ſecond or Haggai's Temple: an impoſſible attempt, but yet they have endeavoured at it, and would perſuade us, that a new Temple at Jeruſalem, whoſe foundations and ſuperſtructure were all the work of Herod alone, was with propriety eſteemed to be one and the ſame identical Temple with that which had been built 500 years before

by

by the Prophet Haggai. The greateſt and moſt learned men have given into the opinion; even the very great and learned Archbiſhop Uſher ſeems to have adopted it for *ſub anno ante Chriſtum* 16; ſpeaking of *Conſtantine l' Empereur*, he hath theſe words, *In cujus præfatione ex conſtanti Hebræorum ſententiâ oſtendit Zerubbabelis et Herodis templum pro eodem recte fuiſſe habitum.* One would have thought that this conſtant and general opinion of the Jews would have been a ſtrong proof that Herod had not built any new Temple at Jeruſalem; for how could it be Zerubbabel's Temple if it was Herod's? How could it be the ſecond Temple if it was the third? How could it be that Temple which Pompey entered, if it was a Temple which Pompey never ſaw, and which Herod built after Pompey was dead. Great ſurely hath been the faſcinating power of this ſuppoſed teſtimony of Joſephus, that could induce ſo many of the moſt learned men in the world to ſurrender themſelves up to an opinion ſo deſtitute of all good foundation. Certain it is that they have ſurrendered themſelves up to it, and while they have done ſo, have endeavoured to perſuade both themſelves and others that the opinion is nevertheleſs conſiſtent with the truth

of

the Prophecy of Haggai, which it moſt aſſuredly is not; for Haggai's Prophecy relates to no other Temple but that which was building when he delivered it; and which Temple, he foretells, was to be filled with a greater glory of the Lord of Hoſts than Solomon's was. But this we well know it never was before the days of Herod; and if Herod took it all down, removing even the foundations of it, we know it never was, or could be at any time afterwards; therefore the conſequence is, Haggai predicted of the ſecond Temple what never happened to it, and therefore Haggai did prophecy what was not true. But upon ſuch an occaſion as this the Hiſtorian, if he had ſaid as his interpreters have ſuppoſed, muſt not be complimented with credit at the expence of the Prophet of God—*Numeretur potius princeps inter mendaces Hiſtoricus*. Let the Prophet of God be true, whatever may become of the Hiſtorian. Joſephus himſelf acknowledges him to have been a Prophet of God, and that God ſpake to the Jews by him, and that they gave credit to him as ſuch; and therefore if Joſephus hath written any thing that is contrary to this acknowledged Prophet, he muſt not be believed. However it doth not appear that he hath written any thing that is

contrary to, or that at all affects the truth of the Prophecy, if what has been already ſuggeſted is admiſſible. And any ſufficient well-grounded reaſon againſt its being admitted, perhaps, it may not be eaſy to produce. Certain it is, that under the received interpretation of his words, the Hiſtorian is inconſiſtent with, and contrary to himſelf; and equally certain that, under the interpretation which has been ſuggeſted, that inconſiſtency and contrariety is done away; and therefore undoubtedly the ſuggeſted interpretation is at leaſt more eligible than the other, and eſpecially as it ſaves the credit of the Hiſtorian, and leaves the truth of the Prophecy unimpeached. However of this the learned muſt judge, with whom the interpretation is left for their cenſure or approbation, as it is by no means intended to be obtruded upon them.

Perhaps it may not be amiſs to ſubjoin a remark or two; and firſt, that the word θεμελίως, in the Hiſtorian's language, is by no means ſo confined and limited by its connection with other words as to ſignify preciſely and abſolutely the foundations of the Temple that was then ſtanding, and nothing elſe: for though it is ſaid that when Herod had laid other foundations he erected τὸν ναὸν upon them, yet

we

we all know that in the uſe of the Hiſtorian the word ναος is applied to a part, or even an appendage of the Temple, as well as to the whole Temple. Moreover it is remarkable that he himſelf tells us that the word in its true ſtrict acceptation, is applicable only to the ſanctuary, of which he ſays ὁ ναὸς ἐν τούτῳ, and that Herod was prohibited from having any thing to do with that; therefore when he ſays Herod τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε he means ſomething that was not the ſanctuary; conſequently, in the paſſage here referred to, τὸν ναὸν doth not ſignify the whole Temple. But if θεμελίους may not ſignify the foundations of the whole, much leſs may it ſignify the foundations of a part of the Temple. Ἀνελὼν τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεμελίους is too explicit to admit of any ſuch interpretation, it muſt ſignify either the whole or none; but as it may not ſignify the whole, if the Hiſtorian is to be interpreted conſiſtently with himſelf, therefore it hath no relation at all to the foundations of the temple then ſtanding, but relates to ſome other foundations; which, becauſe he thought it was unneceſſary, or for ſome other reaſon, beſt known to himſelf, the Hiſtorian did not think fit particularly to ſpecify: and theſe, as it ſhould ſeem, were the foundations remaining unbuilt upon in the ground plot of

Solomon's Temple. And it is very probable that theſe foundations were ſtill remaining, even to the time of Herod; for the Jews, conſidering the plot upon which the edifice of Solomon's Temple had been erected as holy conſecrated ground, we may be ſure would not ſuffer any other buildings to be erected there, and much leſs would they have removed the foundation ſtones for the ſake of applying them to any ſecular purpoſe; and therefore, there, it may be very fairly preſumed they continued undiſturbed till the time of Herod; and being there, therefore, it was neceſſary that Herod, when he entered upon his propoſed ſcheme of lengthening the Temple, muſt either have built upon thoſe foundations, or have removed them, and laid others in their room; the latter of which, it is conceived, the Hiſtorian tells us he did. But there is another reaſon why it may be preſumed that the foundations did remain to the days of Herod, in that part of the ground plot of Solomon's Temple which was unbuilt upon, and that is in order to be plain and indiſputable evidence of the extent of that Temple. From the Prophecy of Haggai it was natural for them to conclude, that their Temple, in ſome future period of time, would be rendered equal

in

in its dimenſions to that of Solomon's. Its glory they knew was to be greater, and they perhaps might think that could not be except it obtained the ſame extent; and therefore, in expectation that an event of this kind would at ſome time or other take place, they might religiouſly leave the foundations undiſturbed, to the intent that every thing, when the work ſhould be ſet about, might be aſcertained with accuracy and exactneſs. It is true, all this is only conjecture, but then it hath nothing improbable in it; on the contrary, it hath much of probability; and in matters of this nature, where we have not the evidence of fact to guide us, we muſt of neceſſity be guided by the evidence of probability; and in proportion as the degrees of probability are increaſed, in the ſame proportion is its evidence ſtrengthened. Now it is moſt certain we have no evidence of the foundations being removed at any time, either by the Babylonians or the Jews themſelves; and therefore there is no evidence to interrupt us in the ſuppoſition that they remained undiſturbed, as hath been already concluded. Hence, as the Babylonians did not, and as there is nothing to oppoſe againſt the very ſtrong reaſons we have for ſuppoſing that the Jews would not, remove them, therefore

fore the probability that the foundations did remain undiſturbed till the days of Herod is increaſed to ſo great a degree that it almoſt amounts to a direct and certain evidence.

It is true, that which would deſtroy the whole of what is here ſuggeſted, is the obſervation of the learned Dr. Prideaux, in which perhaps there may be others that do concur with him, but which, at the ſame time, appears to be moſt clearly a miſtake. For in his Connection (ſub anno ante Chriſtum 534) he thus expreſſeth himſelf: "The "difference between the former Temple and "this which was now a building, was ſo "great that God tells the Prophet Haggai, "that the latter in compariſon with the for-"mer was as nothing, ſo much did it come "ſhort of it. But this is not to be under-"ſtood of its bigneſs; *for the ſecond Temple* "*was of the ſame dimenſions with the firſt, it be-*"*ing built upon the very ſame fonndations, and* "*therefore it was exactly of the ſame length* "*and breadth.*" But what ſaith the decree (Ezra vi. 3)—"In the firſt year of Cyrus "the king, the ſame Cyrus the king made "a decree concerning the Houſe of God at "Jeruſalem—Let the Houſe be builded in "the place where they offered ſacrifices, and "let the foundations thereof be ſtrongly laid;

"*the*

"*the height thereof threeſcore cubits, and the* "*breadth thereof threeſcore cubits.*" From this decree it appears moſt clearly that the learned Doctor was miſtaken; for, as it doth not ſay that the Temple was to be built of the ſame dimenſions with the firſt; therefore there is no reaſon to conclude from the decree that the dimenſions were the ſame. But there is the greateſt reaſon in the world to conclude from the decree, that the dimenſions were not the ſame: for the decree directs that the *breadth* of the Temple ſhall be ſixty cubits, without taking any notice at all of the length, and therefore the length was included in the breadth, which is the caſe of every ſquare building; conſequently the decree directs that the Temple to be built ſhould be a ſquare of ſixty cubits. But the firſt Temple was not a ſquare of ſixty cubits; for, although in breadth it was ſixty, in its length it was an hundred, therefore it exceeded the ſecond Temple in its dimenſions by forty cubits. It is a little ſurpriſing that the learned Doctor ſhould have fallen into a miſtake of this kind, which is not only oppoſed by the decree itſelf, but by the circumſtances which attended the execution of the decree; for, when the ancients ſaw the *foundations* of the ſecond Temple laid, we are told

told they wept with a loud voice. But if the foundations were laid exactly in the ſame extent as the foundations of the former Temple, what poſſible inducement could they have for this? inſtead of a cauſe of ſorrow to them it ought to have been the contrary, a cauſe of great joy; therefore, beſide the teſtimony of the decree itſelf, this circumſtance affords very ſtrong evidence that the foundations of the ſecond Temple were not laid, as the learned Doctor hath ſurmiſed, exactly in the ſame extent with the foundations of the firſt. It is preſumed nothing farther need be ſaid to obviate any objection which might be derived from ſo palpable a miſtake as this. The decree directs that the Houſe of God ſhall be builded threeſcore cubits in breadth, without mentioning any thing of its length, therefore it was to be threeſcore cubits each way, conſequently a ſquare; but Solomon's Temple was ſixty cubits in breadth, and an hundred in length, therefore the ſecond Temple in its extent was forty cubits ſhort of Solomon, and conſequently forty cubits of the ground plot of Solomon's Temple were left unbuilt upon.

It is hardly conceivable that any one will object to what has been ſaid from the title which is prefixed to the laſt chap. Antiq. xv.

leſt

leſt however any one ſhould, it may be proper to obſerve, firſt, that the titles are ſuppoſed, and with good reaſon, not to have been affixed to the chapters by Joſephus himſelf, but by ſome other, who from a perſuaſion that Herod had new built the Temple, thought fit, inſtead of κατεσκεύασε, to write Ὡς Ηρώδης τὸν ναὸν μετεσκεύασε, which at the ſame time the Hiſtorian no where ſays; however, if he had ſaid it, there would have been no great difficulty in getting over it, ſince he who changes a building from a ſquare to a parallelogram may moſt truly be ſaid to have altered the form of it, and that Herod did this is not denied, for he added forty cubits to the length of it, and thereby rendered the Temple, inſtead of a ſquare of ſixty cubits, a parallelogram, whoſe longeſt ſides were an hundred cubits; ſo that let what will have been the opinion of the prefixer of the title, the term he has uſed affords no juſt ground for objecting to what has been ſaid, ſince the figure of a building may be changed in an hundred inſtances without any kind of neceſſity of pulling it down and new building it.

But there is one other objection to what has been ſaid, which may be thought of a more ſignificant nature, derived from the ſe-

cond chapter of St. John's goſpel, wherein, as it is thought, Herod's new built Temple is referred to. Our Saviour had ſaid to the Jews, "Deſtroy this Temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up;" and they in reply to him ſay τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, which in our tranſlation is thus rendered, "forty and ſix years was this Temple in building;" which ſome very learned men have conceived to have been a miſtranſlation, and in the tranſlation of the very learned Archbiſhop Uſher is thus rendered—*Quadraginta et ſex annis hactenus ædificatum eſt Templum hoc:* in Engliſh thus—*it is now forty and ſix years ſince this Temple was built*, or *hath been built*; which at the ſame time, if it really expreſſes the Archbiſhop's meaning, is a ſtrange tranſlation; becauſe, if the Jews anſwered our Saviour in this manner, their anſwer is nothing to the purpoſe. Their intention evidently was to inhance the difficulty of building the Temple in three days. But what was it to the purpoſe how long the Temple had been built? How did that inhance the difficulty of building it in three days? Suppoſe then the Archbiſhop's meaning to be more truly expreſſed by theſe words—*It is now forty and ſix years that this Temple hath been in building*. This indeed may apply,

apply, and ſuch an anſwer as this may be pertinent, but then it is a queſtion whether *hath been in building* is a more allowable tranſlation of ᾠκοδομήθη than *was in building*, it ſhould ſeem that it is not. Be this however as it may, none of the tranſlations have any tendency to prove that the Temple was taken down and rebuilt by Herod. Moreover it ſhould ſeem as if this criticiſm of *Lidiatt*'s (for from him the Archbiſhop derives it) is not juſt, and that ᾠκοδομήθη is to be rendered either *was built*, or *hath been built*, as the words with which it is in connection may direct, for if it is always to be rendered *hath been*, it will make ſtrange work with Joſephus, as alſo with many other Greek writers. Till after the Reformation it does not appear that this anſwer of the Jews to our Saviour was ever interpreted as relating to any thing but Haggai's Temple, to which it was conceived the words were applicable, though how they were applicable to it was never clearly made out, as chronologers differed exceedingly from one another upon the ſubject. Perhaps, even in the Archbiſhop's application of the words, there may be ſome difficulty in making out the chronology, ſo as to anſwer with exactneſs; and perhaps likewiſe there may be no

application of the words whatever in which the chronology can be exact. For the ſaying itſelf may not, for any thing we know to the contrary, be exactly true. It is by no neceſſity a truth, becauſe it was the reply of the Jews to our Saviour. We are under no obligation to perſuade ourſelves that it is true, becauſe the Evangeliſt hath recorded it as the reply of the Jews. It might be, and moſt probably was, a tradition among them, that the Temple was forty and ſix years in building, and yet the tradition might not have been accurately exact, or if it was exact might depend upon certain circumſtances to which we are entire ſtrangers, and concerning which we now can obtain no intelligence; and therefore any argument drawn from hence in favour of a new built Temple by Herod is of no validity at all. * It ſhould

* The Archbiſhop, for the purpoſe of making out the Chronology, reckons from the 21ſt year of Herod, which 21ſt year of Herod complete, happened 13 years before the birth of Chriſt. Now the 13th year before Chriſt was the 3987th year of the world: and the year of the world in which the matter under conſideration happened was 4034; and thus, from the 21ſt of Herod complete, to the time of our Saviour's firſt entering perſonally upon his miniſtry, will be 47 years complete. But the Archbiſhop governs himſelf by the years of the Julian period, and making the 21ſt year of Herod coincident with the 4697th year of that period, that will be juſt 46 years to the time of our Saviour's entering upon his miniſtry. But this likewiſe is liable to objections; for, if allowed, Herod muſt have been more than two years in providing his materials,

ſeem as if this new tranſlation of ὠκοδομήθη had been received for the ſole purpoſe of giving a ſanction to the adopted notion of Herod's having new built the Temple, and to enable the ſupporters of it to juſtify themſelves by ſome other teſtimony, beſide the ſuppoſed teſtimony of Joſephus, on which teſtimony it otherwiſe alone depends. For, though it is ſaid that the Talmud takes notice of Herod's marble Temple at Jeruſalem, that teſtimony is too late to be of any authority; and beſides, the Talmud might uſe this language, and ſpeak of the Temple at Jeruſalem with propriety enough under the title of Herod's marble Temple, on account of the marble caſings, and additional buildings which he had made to it. And there is no manner of occaſion for ſuppoſing that Herod took down the whole of Haggai's Temple, and built a new one in its room, in order to reconcile what the Talmud ſaith with propriety of language or truth. But concerning the paſſage in St. John, if it muſt be referred to the time when Herod firſt entered upon his works about the Temple (for which, at the ſame time, there does not ſeem

rials, and beſides, why ſhould we not reckon from the 15th year of Herod, as well as from the 21ſt, the authority being juſt the ſame in both caſes, that is Joſephus himſelf.

to

to be any kind of neceſſity) let us ſee whether it cannot be made out ſo as to correſpond with that without ſuppoſing the Temple to have been entirely taken down. The Evangeliſt then tells us that Jeſus found *in the Temple* ἐν τῳ ἱερῳ thoſe that ſold oxen, ſheep, &c. and that he drave them all *out of the Temple* ἐκ τȣ ἱερȣ̃, and that when the Jews aſked him what ſign he ſhewed ſince he did theſe things; he anſwered them, Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τȣτον κ᾽ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτὸν—"Deſtroy *this Temple*, and in three days I will rear it up again." In reply to which the Jews, not rightly underſtanding him, make anſwer: "Forty and ſix years hath *this Temple* ὁ ναὸς ȣ̃τος been in building," &c. Here then the firſt thing to be taken notice of is the variation of the Evangeliſt's phraſe from ἱερον to ναος the next thing is, that Jeſus having been driving the ſellers out of the Temple, he moſt probably, when the Jews queſtioned him, was in the exterior parts of the Temple, thoſe parts which had been new built by Herod; therefore when he anſwered them, ſaying, "Deſtroy *this* Temple," they thinking, by his uſing the word τȣ̃τον that he meant particularly that part of the Temple in which they then were, reply to him ὁ ναὸς ȣ̃τος—"THIS Temple hath been forty and ſix years

years in building," &c. and ſo the words may well apply without any neceſſary ſuppoſition or implication, that the whole Temple had been entirely taken down and rebuilt by Herod; and therefore, as the words may apply in this manner, no argument can fairly be drawn from hence to juſtify the notion which has been derived from the common intepretation of Joſephus; a notion which, if any credit is given to what hath been already ſaid, cannot be maintained without the greateſt inconſiſtency as being totally deſtitute of any foundation in truth.

Having thus, then, obviated any objection which might be derived from this paſſage in St. John, and no other objection occurring that particularly requires to be taken notice of, what remains now is to conſider the Prophecy of Haggai, at leaſt as far as it is connected with the ſubject of our preſent diſcuſſion, in order to ſhew that, interpret it how you will, it hath no truth in it, if it is a truth that Herod pulled down and demoliſhed the foundations of the Temple which was building when the Prophecy was delivered. Now there are two modes of interpreting it. The one is adopted by thoſe who think it relates ſolely to the material building, and the ornaments and decorations

it

it was in future to receive, whereby it would be rendered a more magnificent Temple than Solomon's; and the other is that which ſuppoſes it to be a prophecy of the Meſſiah, who, by his advent and perſonal manifeſtation in it, would fill it with the divine glory, and thereby render it ſuperior to Solomon's. There is indeed a third way of intepreting the Prophecy (if it may be called interpreting) and that is, by diſcarding the literal meaning of it, ſo that the words *this houſe* ſhall not ſignify *this houſe*, but a future diſpenſation of religion, and thus turning the whole into a metaphor. But this needs no confutation, as it will be thought ſufficient to have mentioned it.

Now the firſt mode of interpreting the Prophecy proceeds upon this ſuppoſition, that the word which in the Engliſh tranſlation is rendered "deſire" is improperly ſo rendered, and that it ought to be tranſlated "deſirable or precious things," and thus, inſtead of "the deſire of all nations ſhall come," the paſſage will be, the "deſirable or precious things of all nations ſhall come;" and as it is farther ſuppoſed that theſe were to come for the purpoſe of decorating and beautifying the Temple, therefore the greater glory which the Prophet promiſes to the building was to be

be derived from them, and them only, without any regard to the perſonal appearance of the Meſſiah in it, who, it is contended, never did appear in it at all, it having been all taken down, and its foundations all demoliſhed, before he was born, by Herod. But the favourers of this interpretation forget a very material circumſtance, and it is that, if what they ſay is true, the Temple was all taken down before the Prophecy ever had any accompliſhment, according to their own interpretation. For they do not deny but that the Prophecy foretells that the ſecond Temple ſhould be more ſplendid and magnificent in the richneſs of its decorations and beauty, than Solomon's. They do not deny this becauſe it is the thing they inſiſt upon, and becauſe they maintain that it is all that is meant by the Prophet, when he ſays, "the glory of this latter houſe ſhall be greater than of the former." Now then let them ſhew when this *their* Prophecy (for by this interpretation they have made it their own) ever had any accompliſhment, prior to the ſuppoſed demolition of the Temple by Herod. The ſurmiſe of the learned Doctor Heberden, as already cited, extends no farther than to a ſuppoſition that the ſecond Temple did in proceſs of time become equal to the

firſt in every thing, except in its not having the ark and ſhechinah. But this ſurely will not be called the accompliſhment of a prophecy which in expreſs terms ſaith—" The glory of this latter Houſe ſhall be GREATER than of the former. But the learned Dr is altogether miſtaken; for the material building of the ſecond Temple never was, nor, antecedent to the 21ſt of Herod, ever could have been, equal to the firſt. For, if it had, what occaſion had Herod to take it down, as the learned Doctor ſuppoſes he did? Would he have taken down, as defective, a building that in the ſuperbneſs and magnificence of its ſtructure was equal to Solomon's. Let the learned Doctor recollect the words of Herod's harangue to the Jews, as recorded by Joſephus, and then he will ſee, if he gives any credit to the Hiſtorian, how impoſſible it is that his ſuppoſition can be true; for Herod there tells them that the Temple which their fathers built after their return from Babylon was not equal to Solomon's, becauſe it was neither ſo large nor ſo high; that the firſt builders were reſtraind from making it equal by Cyrus and Darius; and that afterwards, through a variety of cauſes, no opportunity had occurred of remedying theſe defects. Therefore the Temple was built defective,

and

and not equal to Solomon's, and continued defective, and not equal to Solomon's till the 18th year of Herod, when this harangue is ſuppoſed to have been made. Hence then it appears moſt plainly that the Doctor's ſuppoſition never did take place antecedent to the time of Herod; and if Herod did as the Doctor ſuppoſes, take the whole Temple down and demoliſh the foundations of it, that it never did and never could take place at any time. So that, after all, nothing will be gotten by giving a conſtruction to the word חמדת ſo different from that generally received. The deſign of giving it the conſtruction of "deſirable or precious things" is in order to accommodate the Prophecy to the ſuppoſition. But the ſuppoſition is itſelf falſe and groundleſs, and therefore no end can poſſibly be anſwered by an attempt to accommodate the prophecy to it by this conſtruction. Moreover the conſtruction is in itſelf abſurd, becauſe it is equivocal, and becauſe no particular idea is aſcertained by it. For "the deſirable or precious things of all nations" may ſignify "the things which all nations deſire, the things which are precious in the eyes of all nations;" or may ſignify "the deſirable and precious things which the ſeveral nations of the world can peculiarly

ſupply." And which of theſe two ſignifications is to be adopted? If the firſt, then we may as well adhere to the Bible tranſlation; and if the ſecond, then we ſhall get much more than we want; for then we ſhall have ſables and tin and rhubarb, and a hundred other things of a ſimilar nature, peculiar to the ſeveral nations of the world. But how theſe ſhould contribute towards rendering the Temple, which was building when the Prophecy was delivered, more ſplendid than Solomon's, it will be difficult to determine. But it will be ſaid, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe that ſuch things as theſe ſhould be meant. Thoſe only are alluded to by which the Temple could be ornamented. When it is ſo expreſſed in the Prophecy then it ſhall be allowed, but aſſuredly not till then. For till the words (if they muſt be ſo tranſlated) "the precious things of all nations ſhall come," can truly be interpreted to ſignify much leſs than the words do certainly expreſs, there muſt be included in their ſignification not only ſilver and gold, but mace and cloves, and a numberleſs farrago of other ſuch articles peculiar to, and the precious things of, the ſeveral nations of the world. Moreover, if we ſuppoſe the Prophet ſays "the precious things of all nations ſhall come," yet it is not

not ſaid whither nor for what end, it is only ſaid in general, without any kind of ſpecification, " the precious things of all nations ſhall come." It will not do to ſay they were to come for the purpoſe of ornamenting the Temple, for the Prophet doth not ſay ſo. And beſides, very little glory would accrue to the Temple from its being filled with, and made a ſtorehouſe for, merchandiſe, as muſt be the caſe, if the words " precious things" are interpreted in the one ſenſe; and if interpreted in the other, the words do not apply at all; for, how would it add to the glory of the Temple becauſe the things ſhould come which were deſireable and precious in the eyes of all nations? But, however this matter may be, nothing certainly will be gained by interpreting the word חמדת " precious things," ſince, if the Temple was taken down by Herod, it never did or could experience a greater glory than Solomon's. As, then, it is ſo certain that the Prophecy never had any accompliſhment, according to the firſt mode of interpreting it, if the ſuppoſed relation of Joſephus is true; ſo likewiſe, in ſuch caſe, it is equally certain that the Prophecy never had any accompliſhment, if interpreted according to the ſecond mode of interpretation, which proceeds upon this ſuppoſition, that

it

it is a prophecy of the advent of the Meſſiah, who ſhould be perſonally manifeſted in that Temple which was then building; and, by his divine preſence in it, ſhould give ſuch a luſtre and glory to it as Solomon's never had experienced, and that thereby the glory of the latter Houſe ſhould be greater than of the former. But as it is well known that the Meſſiah did not come into the world till after the 21ſt of Herod. If Herod did then pull down and demoliſh all the foundations of the Temple, it will be impoſſible that the Meſſiah ever could have been manifeſted in it; and therefore of courſe it follows, that according to this mode of interpretation neither had the Prophecy ever any accompliſhment. Hence therefore as the Prophecy, interpret it how you will, never had any accompliſhment, if the ſuppoſed relation of Joſephus is true, and moreover now never can have any accompliſhment; it follows that the Prophecy itſelf is not a true prophecy. But as all parties are agreed to acknowledge, and as the Hiſtorian himſelf (Antiq. xi. 4.) acknowledges it, that Haggai was a true Prophet; therefore the ſuppoſed relation of Joſephus is a falſe relation, and the Prophecy of Haggai a true prophecy. And a true Prophecy it moſt aſſuredly is of the advent of the

the Meſſiah, and of his perſonal manifeſtation in the ſecond Temple, which came to paſs in the reign of Tiberius Cæſar, when the glory of the Lord of Hoſts was diſplayed viſibly in the Temple, according to what the holy Prophet had foretold.

And indeed any other application of the Prophecy than to the Meſſiah, is wholly inadmiſſible, even though it ſhould be granted that "the deſire of all nations" is not a juſt tranſlation. For prior to the time of Herod we have the moſt ſatisfactory aſſurance that the Temple never obtained the ſame extent with Solomon's; and we are certain likewiſe that it continued defective both in point of extent and height till Herod's time; and therefore, during all that time, inſtead of being ſuperior, it continued inferior in ſplendor and magnificence to the Temple of Solomon; conſequently the Prophecy cannot be applied as foretelling that before the days of Herod the glory (i. e. the magnificence) of the latter Houſe ſhould be greater than of the former. Neither is it applicable, even after all the ſumptuous enlargements of it and additions which were made to it in the days of Herod. For even ſuppoſing, (which will not eaſily be proved) that by thoſe enlargements and additions it became ſuperior in point of magnificence to the

the firſt Temple, it ſtill was defective. It had neither the ark nor the ſhechinah. It had not the glory of Jehovah in it as the firſt Temple had, for the want of which no magnificence of ſtructure, no ſplendor or extravagance of decorations could by any means compenſate. And it is to be obſerved that the Prophecy doth not ſpecifically predict that the greater glory of the ſecond Temple ſhould ariſe from the greater richneſs and ſplendor of its ornaments and decorations. The Prophet ſaith—" The Lord of Hoſts will fill this Houſe with glory, and greater ſhall be the glory of this latter Houſe than of the former ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." Therefore that which is ſpecifically promiſed is, that the Lord of Hoſts would fill this Houſe with glory, and that he would fill it with a greater glory than that with which the former Temple had been filled. Therefore it was his glory, the glory of the Lord of Hoſts with which it was to be filled. But he muſt be diſtracted that ſays the glory of the Lord of Hoſts conſiſts in ſilver and gold, or ſuch things as are valuable and precious among the nations of the world, and it is not worth an argument to confute ſuch an extravagant notion. The Prophet moreover ſaith that the latter Houſe was to have a

greater

greater glory than the former; but as he had before told us that the Lord of Hoſts would fill this Houſe with glory, therefore it of courſe follows that the Lord of Hoſts would fill it with the greater glory, which he here foretells it was to have. Now the glory with which the former Houſe was filled, we have deſcribed 1 Kings, viii. 10, 11. "And it came to paſs, when the prieſts were come out of the Holy place, that the cloud filled *the houſe of the Lord*, ſo that the prieſts could not ſtand to miniſter becauſe of the cloud; *for the* GLORY *of the Lord had* FILLED *the houſe of the Lord.*" With the glory then of this majeſtic though ſymbolical exhibition of the Divine preſence was the former Temple filled. But the Prophet tells us that the Temple then building ſhould be *filled* with a *greater* glory than this. Therefore he prophecies that there ſhould be an exhibition of the divine preſence in this Temple, not enveloped in the darkneſs of a cloud, but perſonal and viſible; conſequently he promiſes that the ſecond Temple ſhould have a greater glory of the Divine preſence than the former had; for as the firſt Temple had the glory of the Divine preſence ſymbolically exhibited in it; if the ſecond Temple had not a greater glory of the Divine preſence exhi-

bited in it, it would not have had a greater glory than the firſt. But how or when was the glory of the Lord manifeſted in the ſecond Temple with greater luſtre and majeſty than in the firſt, except in the perſon of the Meſſiah; who, as the Apoſtle tells us, is the *brightneſs of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon* (Heb. 1.) i. e. The glory of the Lord *without a cloud*, that greater glory with which the Prophet foretold the Temple ſhould be filled. Sufficient ſurely for the accompliſhment of the Prophecy was the preſence of ſo divine a perſon in the Temple, and greater moſt undoubtedly greater was the glory of the ſecond Temple than of the firſt, when the ἀπαύγασμα, the ſplendid the unclouded irradiation of the glory of the Lord was exhibited in it in the perſon of the Meſſiah.

But this greater glory promiſed to the Temple is not the only mark whereby the Prophecy is diſtinguiſhed to be a prediction of the Meſſiah, it concludes in terms equally characteriſtic, equally directed towards him. "And in this place will I give peace ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." Peace of mind, ſaith the Septuagint, but without any the leaſt ſhadow of authority. Peace of mind, ſay they who wiſh to exclude the perſonal manifeſtation of the Meſſiah in the Temple from

from being at all referred to by the Prophecy. But is not this low, groveling, little in the extreme? Were the Jews all maniacs at the time, that the Prophet ſhould tell them they ſhould have peace of mind if they would aſſiſt in completing the Temple? Strange! that great minds ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be poſſeſſed with ſuch little notions. "In this place will I give peace ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." i. e. In this place ſhall be given the peace of the Lord of Hoſts. And what is the peace of the Lord of Hoſts? What indeed but peace and reconciliation with God through the Meſſiah, who was to be manifeſted in this place, and who is our PEACE, *and the Prince of peace.* What was the gratulatory hymn of the angels when they announced the birth of the Meſſiah—GLORY to God in the higheſt, PEACE on earth, good will towards men, all framed as it were out of this Prophecy of Haggai. The εὐδοκια ἐν ἀνθρώποις, intimating that now would be accompliſhed in the acceptance which all nations ſhould meet with at the hands of God; thoſe bleſſings which were promiſed by the Prophecy, when it was ſaid the deſire of all nations ſhould come; for ſuch undoubtedly is the true ſignification of this paſſage, although perhaps not the ſtrict literal tranſla-

tion of the words. Upon the whole, then, as it ſeems to be impoſſible to reconcile the Prophecy with truth by any other application of it than to the Meſſiah, for by any other application of it it never had any accompliſhment; therefore it may certainly be concluded that every interpretation of the Prophecy which excludes it from having reference to the Meſſiah, is without foundation. For if the word חמדת is to have the conſtruction which ſuch interpreters chuſe to give it, and which aſſuredly doth not belong to it, ſtill it will be of no avail, becauſe the Prophecy doth not ſay that the Temple ſhall be filled with the precious things of all nations. The Prophecy doth not ſay that the glory with which the Temple ſhall be filled, ſhall be derived from theſe precious things. But it ſaith that it ſhall be filled with the glory of the Lord of Hoſts, in which the precious things of all nations can have no concern, ſince they are infinitely beneath him. The Prophecy moreover doth not ſay that the glory of the latter Temple by the introduction into it of the precious things of all nations, ſhould be rendered ſuperior to the glory of the former; for the introduction of the precious things of ten thouſand worlds into it would not alone make it equal to the

Temple

Temple of Solomon, which was filled with the glory of Jehovah. But the Prophecy ſaith that Jehovah of Hoſts (not all nations with their precious things) would fill it with glory, and that the glory of this latter Houſe ſhould be greater than of the former. That is, by a more glorious manifeſtation of Jehovah's preſence in it than was exhibited in the Temple of Solomon.

And laſtly, the Prophecy doth not conclude with that poor, miſerable, jejune ſtuff which we meet with in the Septuagint; and and which never was in any Hebrew copy of the prophecy extant in the world; but it concludes in the ſame ſtrong and powerful language in which it began: "And in this place will I give peace, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts." And what that ſignifies let the angels explain, who announced the advent of the Meſſiah into the world.

It may not be proper that theſe pages ſhould be cloſed without taking ſome notice of a ſuggeſtion which the learned Dr. Heberden hath made in the book already cited. And it is, that our tranſlation of the word חמדת is contrary to all the old verſions, and that no ſuch tranſlation would ever have been thought of if the Vulgate Latin had not rendered

dered the word *deſideratus*; which ſuggeſtion, as implying two things that cannot be granted, it will be neceſſary to conſider. The firſt is, that the Vulgate is of no antiquity, and conſequently of no authority at all, except as far as the Romiſh Church has ſtampt authority upon it; and the ſecond, that all the old verſions have an authority which the Vulgate hath not.

With regard to the Vulgate there are three opinions concerning it. The one is, that it is the work of Jerome, who tranſlated the Old Teſtament into Latin from the original Hebrew.

The ſecond is, that the Vulgate which we have now is not that tranſlation which was made by Jerome, but the old italic verſion which was made in the apoſtolic age, or very near to it.

And the third is, that it is neither one nor the other preciſely, but a compound of both; which latter, for reaſons too long to be inſerted here, and well known to the learned, ſeems to be the truth. For it is certain that both verſions, the Italic and Jerome's verſion, continued to be in uſe in the church in the ſixth century, and perhaps longer, and then probably, it being found inconvenient to have two different tranſlations of the ſame ſcriptures

tures in uſe in the Church, it was thought adviſeable to blend them both together, ſo as to give ſatisfaction to the favourers of each verſion, which ſeems to be the beſt account, and neareſt to the truth of any that can be given of the Vulgate as we have it at this day. Hence therefore it appears that the Vulgate certainly hath ſome antiquity, and as far as that authority goes, hath likewiſe the authority of antiquity, without at all appealing to the fictitious authority ſtamped upon it by the Court of Rome at the Council of Trent. For if it be ſuppoſed to be throughout the verſion which Jerome made in the 4th century, it is then at leaſt 1400 years old.* If inſtead of Jerome's it is ſuppoſed

* When Jerome's verſion was firſt publiſhed (it being ſo contrary to the verſions from the Septuagint then in circulation) it raiſed a great clamour againſt him. In anſwer to which he replies; "that he could ſay, and ſay it with the utmoſt confidence, and that he could produce a number of witneſſes to the truth of what he ſaid, that in no ſingle inſtance had he departed in his tranſlation from the truth of the Hebrew. If therefore, ſays he, my verſion is different from the ancient verſions, *interroga quemlibet Hebræorum et liquido prævidebis me ab æmulis fruſtra lacerari* &c." And this he repeats more than once; that he was not conſcious to himſelf of having departed in the leaſt degree from the truth of the original Hebrew, and refers his calumniators to any Jew of their own choice whom they could confide in, who would ſatisfy them whether he had or not.

Is it not wonderful that no Jew upon this challenge would convict him of falſhood in his verſion of the Prophecy of Haggai, if that verſion is not according to the Hebrew?

to

to be the old Italic verſion, it is then a great deal older, and is very nearly coetaneous with the days of the Apoſtles; and if it is (as moſt probably it is) a compound of thoſe two verſions, then it will be found to conſiſt of a mixed antiquity, the loweſt degree of which will be from the 4th century. So that the Vulgate is not ſo deſpicable in point of authority as the ſuggeſtion of the learned Doctor might induce the reader to imagine; and in fact hath as good a claim to authority as almoſt any of thoſe verſions which are ſet in oppoſition to it, which none of them have any other claim to authority than that which is derived from their antiquity.

The firſt Chriſtian verſion of the Old Teſtament that we know of, or at leaſt what is ſuppoſed to be the firſt, is the old *Syriac*; which, as we are told, was made in the days of the Apoſtles themſelves, and directly from the Hebrew. But how far this is true we know not, nor at this time of day is it poſſible for us to determine. However the learned ſeem in general to be of opinion, that it was made within the firſt century after Chriſt, and give it the character of being the beſt of all the ancient verſions. But whereas they ſay it was made directly from the original Hebrew, that will admit of ſome doubt, as there

are

are inſtances wherein it doth not correſpond with the original Hebrew.

The next verſion in point of time, if not equal in age with the Syriac, was the Italic verſion, which was the Vulgate of the Latin Church, and continued to be ſo till the end of the fourth century, and for many years after. But this verſion was not made from the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint, and therefore no doubt contained all the errors of that tranſlation.

The next was the verſion of Aquila, an apoſtate from Chriſtianity to Judaiſm; who, although he affected to make it *verbum verbo* from the Hebrew, yet did it in ſuch a manner as to render it moſt oppoſite to the purpoſes of Chriſtianity, and therefore it was in great eſtimation with the Jews, who, rejecting the Septuagint in all their diſputes with the Chriſtians, made uſe of Aquila's verſion inſtead of the Septuagint.

After Aquila's followed the verſions of Symmachus and Theodotion, who were both *Ebionites*, a mongrel ſect, which profeſſed to believe in Jeſus Chriſt as the Meſſiah, but withal obſerved circumciſion, and all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewiſh law, eſteeming of Jeſus Chriſt no otherwiſe than as of a mere man. Their verſions therefore may be called

rather perverſions of the Scriptures than any thing elſe, as calculated to juſtify themſelves and their ſect in their ſeveral wild and fantaſtic opinions.

Beſides theſe we have an account of three other Greek verſions, or rather partial verſions of the Old Teſtament, which were preſerved by Origen in his Hexapla, but when or by whom made is not known; they are now all loſt, and therefore thoſe which have been already mentioned are all the old verſions (made ſince the promulgation of Chriſtianity) which poſſibly can be referred to, when it is ſuggeſted that the Vulgate Latin is in oppoſition to all the old verſions. Other verſions doubtleſs there are, old with reſpect to us, but ſubſequent to the time of Jerome, which do not tranſlate as the Vulgate hath tranſlated in the matter before us; and how ſhould they? for theſe verſions being all made from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew, it can be nothing extraordinary that they do not expreſs themſelves conſonant to the Vulgate, where it was not made from the Septuagint but from the Hebrew. So that, upon the whole, the ſuggeſtion that our tranſlation is contrary to all the old verſions, and that no ſuch verſion would ever have been thought of if the Vulgate Latin had not rendered the word חמדת *deſideratus*, is a ſuggeſtion

geſtion that hath not any ſufficient foundation. The verſions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, whatever they may be in this matter, can be of no conſequence, conſidering the men and their deſigns. The Italic verſion was made from the Septuagint, and therefore, if it had remained perfect till this time, would have been of no validity in a matter of this nature; and the old Syriac, if it renders the paſſage in diſpute conformable to the Septuagint, we need not heſitate to pronounce, notwithſtanding the encomiums beſtowed upon it, that it was made from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew; and as for any of the other verſions, ſuch as a ſecond Syriac, made in the ſixth century, the Arabic, the Gothic, &c. if they do not tranſlate as Jerome doth it is of no manner of conſequence; for, as they are confeſſedly tranſlated from the Septuagint, it would have been marvellous indeed if the tranſlators had expreſſed the ſenſe of the Hebrew, which they were not tranſlating, inſtead of the ſenſe of the Septuagint, which they were.

It cannot be but with great reluctance, and even pain, that any one finds himſelf obliged to differ upon ſuch a ſubject as this from a perſon of Dr. Heberden's great worth and eminence,

eminence. But aſſuredly in the preſent inſtance the Doctor appears to be much miſtaken. And as miſtakes are not always confined to individuals, or limited in their conſequences, it was thought neceſſary to take notice of theſe miſtakes of the Doctor, leſt by any means they ſhould obtain a patronage which they are not entitled to, under the ſanction of ſo very reſpectable a character.

THE END.

SUPPLEMENT.

IT being ſuggeſted in the preceding Tract, that the length of Solomon's Temple was one hundred cubits, which, in the opinion of ſome, is more than the ſcripture account will juſtify us in ſuppoſing it to have been; the following diſquiſition may perhaps throw ſome light upon the ſubject.

Were there no other account of the dimenſions of the Temple, but that which is given us in 2 Chron. iii. we could have no difficulty at all in allowing it to have been of the dimenſions aſſigned to it in the preceding pages; for it is expreſsly ſaid, that the length of the Houſe, which is afterwards called the greater houſe, to diſtinguiſh it from the moſt holy Houſe, was ſixty cubits, the length of the porch, twenty cubits, and twenty likewiſe the length of the moſt holy Houſe; ſo that the length of the whole evidently, according to this account, was one hundred cubits at leaſt; but if this is the meaſure of it in the clear, as is moſt probable, then the length of the whole, from out to out, muſt have been more than an hundred cubits. As far, therefore, as this ac-

count goes, the ſuggeſtion concerning the length of Solomon's Temple is ſufficiently juſtified. But it ſeems this account, thus interpreted, doth not correſpond with that which is given us, upon the ſame ſubject, 1 Kings vi. where we read thus: "And he "built twenty cubits on the ſides of the "Houſe, both the floor and the walls, with "boards of cedar, he even built *them* for it "within, *even* for the Oracle, *even* for the "moſt holy *Place*. And the Houſe, that *is*, "the Temple before it, was forty cubits "long." Now, if the length of the Temple, before the Oracle, was only forty cubits, the length of the greater Houſe, ſpoken of in Chronicles, could not have been ſixty cubits; and the ſixty cubits there mentioned, muſt have been the meaſure of the two houſes, taken together: and of courſe the length of the whole, including the porch, was only eighty cubits. Thus we find Joſephus underſtood it, for (Antiq viii. 3.) he thus expreſſes himſelf, Διελων δε τον ναον εις δυο, τον μεν ενδοθεν οικον εικοσι πηχων, εποιησεν αδυτον ειναι· τον δε τεσσαρακοντα πηχων αγιον ναον απεδειξεν. And again, ταυτα παντα ειχεν ὁ των τεσσαρακοντα πηχων οικος προ του καταπετασματος τ̃ αδυτ̃. All which, if Joſephus himſelf is not miſtaken, is certainly very clear and explicit. But perhaps

Joſephus

Joſephus was miſtaken, and undoubtedly he was, if we are to be guided by the ſcripture account: For, that the Oracle, or Holy of Holies, was no part of the ſixty cubits, ſeems thus to be very clearly proved, 1 Kings, vi. 2. "And the Houſe which king Solomon built "for the Lord, the length thereof was "threeſcore cubits, and the breadth thereof "twenty cubits, and the height thereof "thirty cubits;" and at the 9th verſe, "So "he built the Houſe, and FINISHED it, and "covered the Houſe with beams and boards "of cedar." After this, the building of the Oracle, or Holy of Holies is mentioned, and at the 20th verſe, are theſe very remarkable words, "And the Oracle in the fore part of "it,* was twenty cubits in length, and "twenty cubits in breadth, and twenty cu-"bits in the height thereof;" doubtleſs, therefore, it could be no part of that Houſe, whoſe demenſions had been before given;

* This tranſlation doth not ſeem, by any means, accurate; for how is it poſſible, that the Oracle *in the fore part of it*, could have the dimenſions here aſſigned? Perhaps it may be thought too bold an interpretation of the words ולפני הדביר to render them "And the Oracle, in the clear of it was, &c." But without ſome ſuch interpretation, the paſſage will hardly be thought intelligible. It will not be denied, but that לפני hath the ſignification of *intus*, *interius*, &c. and if ſo, in the preſent inſtance, it ſeems as if it might very juſtifiably be rendered "in the clear."

for that Houſe was THIRTY cubits in height, and therefore, if the Oracle had been a part of that Houſe, it muſt have been as that Houſe was, thirty cubits in height; whereas it is expreſsly ſaid, that it was only "twenty cubits in the height thereof." To obviate this, ſome have conceited, that the floor of the Holy of Holies was raiſed higher than of the Temple before it, and that there was a flight of ſteps up to it. Others have conceited, that the floor was not raiſed, but that there was a falſe roof, in order to lower it to the height only of twenty cubits. But this is all ſaid at random, and without any kind of authority whatever; and beſides, is too abſurd to have any degree of probability. For, on a ſuppoſition that the floor of the Holy of Holies was raiſed ten cubits higher than that of the Temple which was before it, the aſcent up to it muſt have conſiſted of a flight of ſteps, no fewer in number than thirty at leaſt, which, on account of the inconvenience it would ſubject the High Prieſt to, in his annual entrance into it, and clad as he was, is not to be conceived. But ſay the aſcent to it was not by ſteps, but by a ſlope, as for the altar; then the ſlope riſing to the ſame height as for the altar, its demenſions moſt probably muſt have been the

ſame

ſame; and it would have been ſixteen cubits broad, and thirty-two long. But then, as this ſlope muſt have been raiſed in the ſanctuary, *i. e.* in the Houſe that was before the Holy of Holies, it would have occupied the greater part of the ſpace that was in it, and have left no room for the furniture that we are told was there, or for the miniſtration of the prieſts. And as for the falſe roof, that conceit ſeems to be more idle than any of the others; for Solomon ſurely muſt have been a moſt wretched architect, to have erected a building thirty cubits in height, which he knew would be ten cubits higher than he had any occaſion for. Is it conceivable that any man, ſkilful and intelligent, as was Solomon, who wanted a building twenty cubits high, ſhould erect it thirty, for the ſake of lowering it to the height he wanted, by means of a falſe roof? The very great abſurdity of this conceit effectually ſerves to deſtroy it. Aſſuredly, therefore, the Holy of Holies was no part of that Houſe which it is ſaid was ſixty cubits in length, twenty in breadth, and thirty in height; for if it was a part cut off from that building, it muſt have had the ſame height as that building had, which it confeſſedly had not. Still, however, the difficulty ariſing from the 17th verſe of the chapter we have

been

been conſidering, remains in its full force; "The Houſe, that is, the Temple before it, "was forty cubits long." And if that Houſe was only forty, it could not be ſixty cubits in length. Here then, the principal thing to be enquired into, is, whether this be a true tranſlation or not: It certainly does not appear to correſpond with the original. The Hebrew hath nothing to determine whether the forty cubits belong to the length, the height, or the breadth, neither doth it unambiguouſly aſcertain of what houſe theſe forty cubits were the meaſure, וארבעים באמה היה הבית הוא ההיכל לפני: which is thus tranſlated by the Septuagint:

Και τεσσαρακοντα πηχεων ην ὁ ναος κατα προσωπον τȣ δαβειρ.

In the tranſlation of Junius and Tremellius it is *Quadraginta autem cubitorum erat domus illa: illud Templum anterius.*

And in the literal tranſlation of Pagninus it is thus: *Et quadraginta in cubito erat domus ipſa Templum anterius.* But theſe tranſlations determine nothing. For, of what houſe were theſe forty cubits the meaſure? and in what reſpect were they the meaſure of it? The Seventy * certainly are not war-

* The Septuagint tranſlation, to have been conformable with

ranted by the Hebrew, in ſaying, that the forty cubits were the meaſure of the Temple that was before the Oracle; and even they do not give them as the meaſure, in length, of that Temple. In ſhort, this paſſage is ſo difficult and obſcure, that it ſeems to be almoſt impoſſible to make any thing of it, with any tolerable degree of certainty. If the Holy of Holies was a part cut off from that Houſe, whoſe length was ſixty cubits, it muſt have had the ſame height as that had; but that houſe was thirty cubits high, and the Holy of Holies only twenty; therefore, the Holy of Holies was no part of that houſe, whoſe length was ſixty cubits. But for a moment, let us ſuppoſe, that the Holy of Holies was taken out of this houſe, the remainder could not have been forty cubits, but muſt have been leſs. For the Holy of Holies was indiſputably twenty cubits in the clear, and if the wall dividing it from the other part, was, as it is ſuppoſed to have been, five cubits in thickneſs, the Temple before the Oracle could have been only thirty-five cubits

with the Hebrew, ſhould have been, ην ὁ οικος αυτος κατα προσωπον τȣ ναȣ and thus the forty cubits (if ſuch be the true ſignification of the Hebrew) will appear evidently to have been ſpoken of the Oracle. But in no ſenſe whatever are forty cubits applicable to the Oracle; therefore it is moſt probable that ſuch is not the ſignification of the Hebrew.

in

in length, *i. e.* in the clear. Hence the forty cubits cannot be the meaſure of the length of that Temple. As neither can they be the meaſure of the length of the Holy of Holies, for that decidedly was only twenty cubits. To what, therefore, can the words be referred? The difficulty of giving any ſatisfactory account of this paſſage is ſo very great, that we are neceſſarily led to ſuppoſe that a wrong interpretation hath been put upon it.

And indeed, if in ſo very intricate an affair as this, a conjecture may be hazarded, the whole chapter, at leaſt as far as the preſent ſubject is concerned, hath been ill interpreted; and to this, perhaps, it is owing that thoſe who have attempted to give a ſatisfactory account of it, have had no ſucceſs. The ſecond verſe, which appears to be ſufficiently conformable to the Hebrew, particularly aſcertains the dimenſions of the Houſe which Solomon built for the Lord. This Houſe, it ſays, was threeſcore cubits in length, twenty in breadth, and THIRTY cubits was the height thereof.

The next verſe gives the dimenſions of the porch, which, in our tranſlation, is in theſe words, "And the porch before the Temple "of the Houſe, twenty cubits was the length "thereof, &c." This ſeems to be imperfectly tranſlated.

tranſlated. The Hebrew, perhaps, will juſtify us in rendering it "And the porch be-"fore the Temple, that is to ſay, before the "Houſe, twenty cubits, &c." The words in our tranſlation, "Before the Temple of the "Houſe," if indeed they convey any idea at all, ſeem to convey a wrong one, and to imply as if "the Temple" was a portion of the Houſe that had been before deſcribed, which was not the caſe; for, tho' the Temple was a portion of the whole Houſe, yet, of that Houſe, inſtead of being a portion of it, it was the whole of it and its diſtinguiſhing title. And that the Oracle was no part of that Houſe, there is a very ſtrong preſumptive argument from the fifth verſe, if the interpretation above given of the words על-פני היכל הבית is a juſt one. For, when it is ſaid he built chambers round againſt the walls of the HOUSE, it is added, both of the Temple and of the Oracle; which, it would have been ſuperfluous to have ſaid if the Oracle had been a portion and not diſtinct from the Houſe here deſcribed.* The deſcription is carried on to

* Although the term "Temple" ſeems to be peculiarly appropriated to the building which was immediately before the Oracle, yet is the term "the Houſe" as certainly applied to it likewiſe. This is put beyond a doubt by the 50th verſe of the 7th chapter, where Solomon is ſaid to have made "hinges of gold both for the doors of the inner Houſe, the "moſt holy place, and for the doors of the Houſe, to wit, of "the Temple."

the end of the fifteenth verſe, where it is particularly ſpecified, that Solomon "covered the floor of the Houſe, *i. e.* of the "Houſe whoſe dimenſions had been given "in the ſecond verſe, with planks of fir."

The ſixteenth verſe begins the deſcription of the Oracle, "Moreover he built twenty "cubits (not *on*, but) from the ſides of the "Houſe," *i. e.* he carried on the ſide walls of the Houſe he had before deſcribed as built and finiſhed twenty cubits farther, which he laid "both on the floor and walls "with boards of cedar, and fitted it up on the "inſide for the Oracle, even for the Holy of "Holies." Then follows, "And forty cu-"bits was the Houſe itſelf, the Temple "*was* before it;" or if we render it "And "forty cubits was the Houſe itſelf, even "the Temple before it." In either caſe the paſſage ſeems to be inexplicable, becauſe there is no ſpecification of what theſe cubits refer to, whether to the length, the breadth, or the height; and, becauſe by the manner in which it is introduced, it ſeems to relate to the Oracle, to which forty cubits are in any ſenſe inapplicable. Indeed, a very ſlight alteration of the text ורבעים inſtead of וארבעים would enable us to give a ſatisfactory account of the paſſage, which might be thus intelligibly rendered, *Et quadrata erat*

in

in cubito domus hæc Templum erat anterius. But unauthoriſed alterations of the text are too licentious, and therefore better is it that it ſhould remain in its preſent obſcurity, than be explained by means which we cannot juſtify. The 18th and 19th verſes proceed to inform us, that the Oracle, on the inſide, was throughout caſed with cedar (and therefore muſt be diſtinct from the Houſe he had before deſcribed, whoſe floor was laid with fir) and that it was fitted up for the reception of the ark of the covenant of the Lord. Then follow its dimenſions: In the clear it was twenty cubits in length, twenty in breadth, and twenty in the height thereof, *i. e.* it was not ſo high by ten cubits as the Houſe before deſcribed, which, as hath been already obſerved, could not have been the caſe, if the Oracle had been a part cut off from that Houſe, and not a building diſtinct from it. And when the writer concludes his account of the ſtructure of this ſacred edifice, he expreſſes himſelf thus remarkably, "And the WHOLE Houſe he "overlaid with gold, until he had finiſhed "ALL the Houſe." Therefore, the Houſe whoſe length was ſixty cubits, and concerning which, at the 14th verſe, it is ſaid, "So Solomon built the Houſe, and finiſhed "it," was not all the Houſe. The whole,

or all the Houſe, conſiſted of the Porch, the Temple, and the Holy of Holies; the firſt, twenty cubits in length, the ſecond, ſixty, and the third, twenty; in the whole one hundred cubits.

Theſe thoughts, be their event what it may, are ſubmitted to the conſideration of thoſe who are beſt able to judge of them. Their tendency, if they have any validity, is to prove that the Oracle was a diſtinct building from that whoſe dimenſions are given in the ſecond verſe. Any objection from the ſeventeenth verſe ſeems to be wholly inadmiſſible, till ſome intelligible and ſatisfactory interpretation can be given of it.* In

* The Syriac and Arabic it ſeems, in this verſe, read עשרים, *twenty*: But whether their authority is ſufficient to juſtify an alteration of the text is much to be queſtioned, and more eſpecially as the Seventy have tranſlated it τεσσαρακοντα.

An ingenious gentleman, who adopts the Syriac reading, thinks the paſſage may be thus intelligibly rendered "And this "Houſe or building of the Temple, in front, was twenty cu-"bits." This conſtruction of the paſſage is certainly very ingenious; but it is to be feared will not hold: for if the ſide walls of the building were each five cubits in thickneſs, and if in the inſide, from wall to wall, meaſured twenty cubits, the extent of the building, in front, inſtead of twenty muſt have been thirty cubits. Perhaps, after all, a difficulty has been created here, where in reality there is none. The extent of the front is certainly known to have been thirty cubits, and, in all probability, extended as the text expreſſes it, forty cubits; and if ſo, the literal tranſlation of the paſſage will be thus, "And "forty cubits was this Houſe (or building) of the Temple, in "front;" which, if admitted, puts an end to all the difficulty of the paſſage, ſo that there will be no occaſion either to alter the text, or to torture the words, for an intelligible interpretation.

its

its preſent ſtate its meaning cannot be aſcertained, and therefore no argument of objection can be framed from it; of courſe, therefore, the conjectural criticiſm on Joſephus in the preceding Tract, ſeems to have loſt none of its force. Perhaps it will be ſtill farther ſtrengthened by the following conſideration:

When Herod took down the Temple, as Joſephus hath been ſuppoſed to ſuggeſt he did in order to rebuild it, we are told, that at the ſame time, he enlarged the area that was round it, and made την περι αυτον χωραν της αυτης διπλασιαν, for which, at the ſame time, there appears not to have been the leaſt call or neceſſity. The ſurrounding area was not complained of; the defect was not there, but in the Temple itſelf. What poſſible occaſion therefore could there be for thus extending the area, and making it as large again as it was before? If Herod was only to continue his new building on the ſame ground plot as the former had ſtood, he could not have wanted more room for this purpoſe; and more room for any other purpoſe, there doth not appear, from Joſephus' account, to have been any kind of call.

The real fact ſeems evidently to have been this: within the area were compriſed the forty cubits of the ground plot of Solomon's Temple,

Temple, which were unbuilt upon under the decree of Cyrus. On theſe Herod was to erect his new building, and as that could not be done, without proportionably diminiſhing την περι ναον χωραν, it became neceſſary that he ſhould add to the area, in proportion to what was ſubtracted from it by the new building. Taking down, therefore, the former wall that ſurrounded it, and carrying it out farther, he built it up again (ανετειχισατο), obſerving to place it at the ſame diſtance from the new buildings as the former wall ſtood from the Temple itſelf, before thoſe buildings were added to it; and this perhaps is what he means by his phraſe της αυτης διπλασιαν. Without ſome ſuch ſuppoſition as this, it ſeems difficult to account for the tranſaction, or to aſſign any tolerable reaſon for Herod's carrying the ſurrounding wall of the Temple out ſo much farther, when the Temple itſelf remained unenlarged. Whereas, if the ſuppoſition here adopted may be admitted, not only the reaſon of the tranſaction becomes viſible, but the tranſaction itſelf is ſo apparently neceſſary, that even if the hiſtory had been ſilent, we ſhould nevertheleſs have concluded the fact to have been as the Hiſtorian has here related it.

Here

Here then this matter muſt reſt, as any farther proſecution of the ſubject ſeems to be unneceſſary. If what has been already ſaid is thought ſufficient to eſtabliſh the opinion advanced, concerning the length of Solomon's Temple, then the Hiſtorian may be, in ſome degree, and very fairly, reſcued from the charge, either of falſehood or abſurdity. If, however, the opinion ſhall be thought to have been ill founded, then the Hiſtorian muſt be left to ſhift as he can for himſelf, and the Houſe, "the GREAT "and wonderful Houſe, which Solomon "built for the God who is GREAT above "all gods," (II. Chron. 2.) will appear to have been a bauble about ninety feet in length, wonderful on account only of its littleneſs, and as having employed in its ſtructure upwards of one hundred and fourſcore thouſand artificers and workmen (1 Kings 5.) for ſeven years together.

ERRATA.

P. 27. l. 19. *After* ετερυς *add a comma.*
Ibid. l. 26. *Dele comma after* them *and add it after* others
P. 55. l. 22. *for* wat *read* was

FINIS.